THE
MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus.*

A State without the means of change is without the means of its conservation.—*Edmund Burke.*

o. 1 MARCH Vol. XXXIX

SIGNS OF THE TIMES

The Christian Religion in U.S.A.

The *Spectator* of January 28th published a significant article n the American Churches by Dr. Sidney M. Berry, Secretary of e International Congregational Council. The conclusions of is English visitor's estimate of American religion will come as surprise to English readers, who, if they think at all about it, gard the Americans generally as irreligious and materialistic. r. Berry indicates that the religious situation in America to-day es not justify this verdict. He writes :

> 'It is not without surprise that one finds that the United States is one of the few countries in the world, perhaps the only country, where the percentage figures for membership of the churches is increasing at a greater rate than the percentage figures for the increase of population. . . . There is no doubt that attendance at church services reaches a much higher figure in America than in Great Britain, and that the life of the churches is more closely integrated with the whole life of the community.'

America is usually regarded as the home of multifarious reli- ous sects. This is true enough, but it is more than counter- lanced by a very strong movement towards Christian Reunion. he idea of the World Council of Churches and the Ecumenical ovement is enthusiastically welcomed even if not entirely under- ood. Although efforts to secure Christian Reunion have not yet hieved organic unity, they have certainly created more friendly lations between the different Christian Communions. The mericans are an essentially practical people, and the waste of oney and energy produced by competing Christian organiza- ons, whose differences are so small compared with their agree- ent, irritates the American business sense.

Dr. Berry notes three characteristics of American Church lif which help to contribute to its growing influence. These may b classed as administrative, social and aesthetic. He writes:

> 'All the churches of any size have on their whole-time staff not onl the minister in charge and his assistant or assistants, but a director c religious education, trained for the work of leadership in that field.
>
> 'In this whole question of staffing, the churches in the United State present a picture of organization which seems strange to us. There i often a whole-time secretary for the administrative side of church life, director of religious education, an organist and choirmaster who i called a minister of music. In the case of the largest churches the sta may consist of as many as twenty or more whole-time officers; indeed in one church which I visited they reckoned the staff at forty. Th premises of the churches match the staffs. Compared with ours the seem palatial, with rooms and halls furnished comfortably for ever aspect of the church's life. A kitchen is always included, for it is par of the normal programme of church life in America that every week ther is a series of lunches and dinners in which different sections of the churc meet together in that way.
>
> 'But if on the social side the churches of the United States are equippe to that standard of comfort, there is an equal, even a greater effort t make the sanctuaries in which Americans worship as beautiful as pos sible. There has been a great development in symbolism, decoration an ceremonial among churches belonging to denominations which in thi country follow the way of unadorned simplicity. Often I have tried t imagine the stunned surprise which an English Free Churchman woul feel in entering a church of his own denomination in the United State: He would find the communion table placed against the wall of the chance decorated with a beautiful cloth, and with cross and candlesticks upon i He would find the service commencing with a hymn sung in procession the gowned choir processing up the aisle followed by the robed minister: And as the service proceeded he would find that it took almost entire a liturgical form. In spite, however, of that unaccustomed elaboratio in ceremony he would probably discover an absence of doctrinal back ground in the teaching given from the pulpit and an emphasis on th ethical and the practical.' (p. 107.)

Our own experience of American Church life in some of th great American cities during the period between the two worl wars harmonizes with Dr. Berry's more recent experiences. Th first thing that impressed us was the wealth of these great churche A New York parish in which we were privileged to minister ha an annual income of 120,000 dollars, and the philanthropic, soci and missionary use made of its vast resources left no one in an doubt of the value of that church in the contribution it was makin both to the higher life and to the happiness of the communit And this was characteristic of other great churches in America cities. Church life in such parishes acquires the social character o a great local club: the primary qualification for membership is become a pew renter — no easy matter. Where seat-holde neglect to occupy their pews regularly they are deprived of then as there is a long waiting list.

Besides the philanthropic and social work of the church, the educational side was very marked, particularly the importance attached to good preaching. This was encouraged by members of the congregation presenting their clergy with interesting and important books and begging them to give their impressions of them in the pulpit. In a number of cases Sunday school teachers were paid, and this made for efficiency. The Rectors of these churches impressed us as men of great ability with outstanding qualities of leadership and administration, working in close touch with an influential body of laity whose confidence they possessed and by whom they were appointed. In the English sense there is no church patronage in America. The parishioners appoint their ministers. This we believe to be one of the secrets contributing to the success of American Church life.

Charles, King and Martyr.

H. A. L. Fisher, the English historian, when the execution of Charles I was being discussed in the Senior Common Room of New College, turned to Hastings Rashdall and said, 'All except you have given their views. What is yours?' The historian of the mediaeval universities replied, 'One of the few entirely satisfactory events in English history.'

The quite extraordinary public interest aroused by the celebration of the tercentenary of the execution of Charles I has not given the impression that those interested are in agreement with Rashdall; but then philosophical historians are rare birds. Yet two contemporary English poets, viewing the execution of Charles I from different angles, would seem each from his point of view to support Rashdall's verdict. John Milton, the fearless protagonist of truth and freedom both in Church and State, viewed the execution as dealing the death blow to 'the right divine of kings to govern wrong.' Andrew Marvell, a man of exquisite taste, contemplated the execution with equal satisfaction. The demeanour of the victim on that exacting occasion fulfilled every aesthetic demand.

> 'He nothing common did or mean
> Upon that memorable scene, . . .
> . . . But bow'd his comely head
> Down, as upon a bed.'

Bishop Horsley, preaching in Westminster Abbey before the House of Lords on January 30th, 1793, declared that the execution of Charles I was responsible for the execution of Louis XVI, and maintained his accusation with such forceful eloquence that

the whole congregation rose to their feet at the peroration. Historically, Bishop Horsley was right. The French Terrorists cited the execution of Charles I as a precedent for their action, but there was a more profound cause—Louis XVI and Charles I were remarkably alike in character.

Canon Charles Smyth, preaching on January 30th, 1949, in St. Margaret's, Westminster, declared that Charles died as the price of both his political duplicity and his religious constancy. This was equally true of Louis XVI, although a much slighter man than Charles.

In the case of Charles, his political duplicity and his religious constancy sprang from the same root. His father, James I, had come to the conclusion that monarchy agreeth as well with Presbytery as God with the devil. This conclusion was as much political as religious. Charles I inherited his father's conviction, and his faith was deepened by Laud and his fellow-bishops proclaiming in season and particularly out of season the divine right of kings and the duty of passive obedience by their subjects.

Laud's disciplinary policy of 'Thorough' directed against the Puritans created the opposing policy of 'Root and Branch,' and in the end brought both the Archbishop and the King to the block. Charles died not as a martyr for the truth, but as the victim of a misguided political and ecclesiastical policy.

Charles' doom was sealed by his belief that the divine right of kings liberated him from keeping faith with rebels. It was this combination in Charles of muddleheadedness and unreliability which compelled Oliver Cromwell, a merciful but clear-headed man, faced by the prospect of a third Civil War, to insist on the king's trial and execution. So died this cultured, charming, affectionate, and very religious man.

Whether his name ought to have been placed in our Church of England Calendar as a day for religious observance raises issues which would involve the examination of the claims of other English royal saints so sympathetically treated in his Bampton Lecture,[1] 'The Royal Saints,' which we heard delivered many years ago by W. H. Hutton before the University of Oxford.

Bishop Rawlinson and the Christian Ministry.

Dr. Rawlinson, Bishop of Derby, one of the few surviving contributors to *Foundations*, of whom it may be said, 'E'en in our ashes live their wonted fires,' has contributed an arresting article on 'Priesthood and Sacrifice in Judaism and Christianity' to the *Expository Times* of February, 1949. The article, primarily

[1] *The English Saints* (1903).

oncerned with the character of the Christian Ministry, is a remarkable combination of eruditon, lucidity and conciseness. It oncludes as follows:

> 'Meanwhile challenging both Protestant and Catholic traditions (but especially the latter), there is the argument of Tertullian, who in a well-known passage appears to derive from the doctrine of the priesthood of the laity the conclusion that, in the absence of all the clergy, a layman could both offer the Eucharist and baptize, all by himself. "Are not even we laymen priests?" he writes. "It is the authority of the Church which makes a difference between the ordained ministry and the people. . . . Accordingly, where there is no bench of clergy, you offer and baptize and are priest alone to yourself." Tertullian here certainly appears to regard the principle involved in lay Baptism as being logically applicable also to the case of a lay Eucharist, finding a basis for both in the "royal priesthood" of all Christians, in support of which he quotes in the context *Rev.* i, 6. It is an arguable position, and it may well be that, in the course of the coming negotiations between Anglicans and non-Anglicans with a view to reunion, the questions implicitly posed by Tertullian will have to be faced. If a layman may in emergency baptize, why may he not in emergency also act as the celebrant of the Eucharist? If the answer be given in terms of St. Thomas' argument with regard to the "dignity" of the sacrament of the Holy Eucharist, why is the "dignity" of the primary Christian sacrament of Holy Baptism not equally great? Why in this matter should there be a distinction drawn between Baptism and Holy Communion? It is not easy to see on what real ground of strict theological principle the distinction can rest.' (p. 121.)

In his article Dr. Rawlinson (without actually mentioning im) accepts the main conclusions on the character of the Christian ministry arrived at by Bishop Lightfoot in his unanswerable Essay published more than half a century ago. That Essay mainains the inherent, universal priesthood of all Christians and that he ordained ministry of the Christian Church is *representative ut not exclusive*. For practical purposes the Christian Church vas compelled to select from its universal priesthood certain nembers who for official purposes would act for the whole body ministerially. The existence of this ministerial order does not deprive the generality of the Christian priesthood from exercising heir priestly functions validly should occasion demand.

In the English Church it is generally recognized that laymen nd laywomen can validly baptize, but this is not recognized in he case of celebrating the Holy Communion. Yet the greater of he two sacraments is undoubtedly Baptism, and this was the onviction of the Primitive Church. As, however, the apostolic loctrine of the Holy Communion gave way to the Miracle of the Mass, Baptism became the minor sacrament and has remained so. Comparisons are odious in such a sphere and we need not pursue hem.

The recognition that the validity of the two great sacraments

is not impaired when celebrated by laymen, if agreed on by all the separated Churches to-day, would do much to promote the cause of reunion. We cannot emphasize too strongly that what is standing in the way of reunion in this sphere is not the maintenance of the succession of the ancient apostolic ministries but the insistence on the absolute necessity for them and that apart from them we cannot be assured of valid sacraments. By all means maintain the ancient ministries, but do not insist that without them there is no true Church and no valid sacraments. It is here that traditional Anglicanism has to make concessions — we have to go back behind St. Ignatius and Clement of Rome.

The Rift between Bishops and Clergy.

The Primate in his recent Presidential Address to both Houses of the Convocation of Canterbury referred painfully to the growth of distrust of the Episcopate by the clergy. This spirit had most unhappily manifested itself in the criticism of the bishops' action in connection with the *Shorter Prayer Book*. As the Primate invited frank expressions of opinion on this rift between bishops and clergy we venture to deal with it here.

In our experience the diocesan bishop is as a general rule held in high regard by his clergy. It is not the diocesan bishop but the Bench of Bishops which is the cause of the rift. This is due to what is commonly called 'the ganging up' of the bishops. As a consequence of this 'ganging up' the diocesan bishop is seen by his clergy in a new light. The diocesan 'Father in God' becomes the official representative of a centralized hierarchy, and voices, when consulted on important pastoral issues, not his personal advice but the decision of the bishops often arrived at in secret session and by which the bishop feels bound. The result is that the clergyman feels that not only has he lost his 'Father in God,' but that his own bishop has lost his rightful freedom of judgment and action and has become a cog in the wheel of a piece of centralized episcopal machinery which, in the name of efficiency, is depriving the parochial clergy of their proper independence and is reintroducing a rigid ecclesiastical uniformity which must replace the large measure of fruitful freedom which the comprehensiveness of our National Church has developed and needs for effective and many-sided influence. This episcopal caucus policy, so it is charged, is responsible for originating parliamentary measures which by various devices secure legalization before the clergy and laity have had due opportunity of considering these measures and so of realizing their far-reaching consequences.

We venture to cite examples of this which are causing deep concern to many parish priests at the present time. The first deals with the selection of candidates for the ministry. In this instance we cite as our authority the leading article of the *Church Times* (January 21st, 1949) entitled 'Final Thoughts on C.A.C.T.M.' Of the episcopal policy which created and directs C.A.C.T.M. the Editor writes:

> 'We remain, however, entirely unsatisfied on the main issue which we raised in December. Mr. Phillips stated that "C.A.C.T.M. is merely an advisory council to the bishops. . . . It does not follow that the Bishops will accept candidates recommended for training, nor does it follow that the bishops will refuse to ordain those who have not first been recommended." That statement was certainly made in all good faith, but it does not correspond with the current practice of diocesan bishops. As far as we know only one bishop in the Provinces of Canterbury and York has ordained a candidate whom C.A.C.T.M. has rejected, and it appears that his action was not well received by the Central Advisory Council. Several bishops have made it quite clear to candidates rejected by C.A.C.T.M. that they are not prepared even to grant them an interview. . . . We have already expressed our view that the final decision for acceptance or rejection should rest with the diocesan bishops and that it is a serious neglect of their chief pastoral duty to delegate that duty to a central committee.'

The second example is concerned with the Pastoral Reorganization Measure (C.A. 845 E) now waiting to go before the Ecclesiastical Committee of Parliament. It is charged against this measure by an influential body of clergymen that

> 'the measure jeopardizes the legal and traditional rights of parochial endowments and Cure of Souls.'

That as a consequence

> 'Many parishes will lose the advantage of a resident Minister without the patron and the parishioners having a final voice in the matter, there being no provision requiring their consent.'

That

> 'Benefice income may be diverted to such an extent, to a diocesan stipends fund, under such terms that a parish may lose very greatly with no compensating advantage. Moreover, once this diverted income is in the Diocesan Stipends Fund it can be used for purposes quite alien to the original intentions of the benefactors.'

And, last but not least, that

> 'We are not satisfied that the Diocesan Conferences were given the opportunity to understand and debate the measure, which either was never brought to their notice or was mentioned in the most cursory manner.'

No doubt this increasing clerical distrust of the Episcopate has as its source the conviction that the power of the Episcopate has increased, is increasing, and ought to be diminshed.'

There is, of course, no doubt that the Life and Liberty Movement which secured the passing of the Church Powers Act has

considerably increased the power of the Episcopate at the expense of both the clergy and the laity, and is at the back of the demand in certain circles for 'constitutional episcopacy.'

To this cause of clerical dissatisfaction with the Episcopate must be added the reduction in the revenues of the Church, the reduction in the number of suitable ordinands, and the episcopal methods of coping with the situation thus created. This has entailed the intervention of the bishops in new ways in Church life and is often spoken of as the 'interference of the bishops,' especially in parochial affairs.

Of course if the bishops could secure a substantial increase in the revenues of the Church, instead of evolving new and irritating methods for the redistribution of the Church's diminishing revenues, episcopal policies would become popular. The same applies to 'manpower' problems. The episcopal refusals to licence curates in parishes which have made provision for a curate on the ground that the lack of manpower and the greater needs of other parishes prohibits the licence being granted in this particular case, create profound annoyance especially among the laity, who complain: 'We have promised to provide an adequate stipend for the curate and a curate's house for a married man, and the bishop ought to have allowed us to have the man we want.'

We are in no position to judge of the rights and wrongs in these cases to which we have referred, but it is the accumulation of them which helps to create distrust of the Episcopate. The latest example of this is the episcopal proposal to 'ration ordinands' by allocating them proportionally among the dioceses. This will deprive the ordinand of his old-time freedom in selecting his diocese and his parish, and of course imposes corresponding restrictions on incumbents in the selection of ordinands as curates.

Another cause of distrust of the Episcopate has been its tacit support of the policy of spending annually on Church advertisement a not inconsiderable sum abstracted without their approval from the voluntary offerings of the parochial laity. This proposal when first mooted was strongly opposed not only in the Church Assembly but also in the Press. Many responsible Churchmen, devoted to the Church's best interests, condemned the policy as a humiliating device unworthy of the Church's spiritual mission and hostile to reliance on sound methods of moral influence. Many Churchmen were convinced, in view of the weight of the opposition to the proposal, that the Episcopate could be relied upon to reject it, but were astonished that in the ultimate issue not a tenth of the Episcopate voted against it.

Another cause of episcopal unpopularity is undoubtedly due to the official refusal of the Episcopate to distinguish between the innocent party and the guilty party in divorce suits and the prohibition of the re-marriage of the innocent party in church. Re-marriage of the innocent party in church the vast majority of the laity claim to be not only their legal right but their Church right, and it is because the parochial clergy have been intimidated by the Episcopate that the laity are precluded from receiving what is their due.

We know how for many years the bishops opposed successfully the marriage of the deceased wife's sister but had to yield in the end. The refusal by the Episcopate, however great the difficulty involved to distinguish between the adulterous and deserting breaker of the marriage bond and the loyal observer of marriage vows, is a recurring offence to English public opinion. 'He that justifieth the wicked and he that condemneth the just are both alike an abomination unto the Lord.'

In this case we do not plead with the Episcopate that they should alter their policy in order to secure popularity, but that their moral and spiritual authority, which is pledged to the authorization and protection of Christian marriage, demands such a change. We hope, indeed, that in every such case the bishop should not continue to shelter himself publicly behind loyalty to a united episcopal decision but would take the line that he, having gone most carefully into this particular application, has reached such and such a decision.

The bishop is always seen at his best when he stands alone. He is *the* Father in God of his diocese; he is *the* monarchical bishop and, as his designation shows, he rules *alone*. The bishops are seen at their worst as a flock. Such assemblies suggest sheep —not shepherds. History presents no more deplorable picture of the Episcopate than Gibbon's description of hordes of bishops in the Conciliar Period riding the post-horses of the Empire to death as they hurried from place to place to attend their episcopal assemblies.

We hope that this endeavour to present an episcopal mirror for the occasional use of our generally respected English Episcopate (indeed, we believe the best Episcopate in the world) may be pardoned.

The Trial of Heretical Bishops.

In this issue of the *Modern Churchman* we publish an important utterance by the Bishop of Birmingham dealing with a clause in the Bishops (Retirement) Measure. This measure in various

forms has been before the Church Assembly since the autumn of 1945. In its present form the measure was introduced by the House of Bishops on May 25, 1948, when Canon C. E. Douglas raised the objection that a clause in the measure sanctioning the trial of a bishop by his fellow-bishops on charges of heresy was *ultra vires* under the Church Assembly's constitution, Article 14. Article 14 runs as follows :

> 'Provided that it does not belong to the functions of the Assembly to issue any statement purporting to define the doctrine of the Church of England on any question of theology, and no such statement shall be issued by the Assembly.'

As a result of this objection by Canon Douglas the matter had to be referred to the House of Bishops to decide whether the objection to the measure was well-founded, and meanwhile the measure was withdrawn until an episcopal decision had been obtained on this point.

At the recent session of the Church Assembly (February 23rd) the Primate announced that the House of Bishops had decided that the objection to the measure raised by Canon Douglas was not well-founded, and that the Bishop of Winchester would move that the discussion of the measure be resumed at the next session of the Church Assembly. At this point the Bishop of Birmingham intervened by asking the Primate to state how the House of Bishops had voted on this issue. The Primate, however, refused to give the information, saying that the proceedings of the House of Bishops were confidential.

We venture to think that this decision of the Primate is not valid, and for the following reasons. The House of Bishops consists of members present at its meeting because they are appointed by the King. They sit there by right, not by the invitation of the Primate. Any bishop present is therefore free to report what has taken place. When the House of Bishops is consulted with the maximum of formality under alike the Constitution and Standing Orders of the Church Assembly, full details of the manner in which a decision is reached and of the voting are of importance and should be available, because they indicate the precise amount of support which their decision has received. If such information is not available it might be assumed by the House of Commons that the decision of the bishops was unanimous, whereas actually the measure might have received only the most meagre support from the episcopate.

There is another point to be borne in mind, and that is that in the House of Bishops the Archbishop, like the Lord Chancellor in the House of Lords, is *primus inter pares* and therefore cannot

mpose silence with regard to any issue brought before the House. f this interpretation be sound, then it seems to us that the Primate ought not to have withheld from the Church Assembly he information which the Bishop of Birmingham requested. Even f the Primate's decision be sanctioned by precedent we cannot ut think that the maintenance of such episcopal secretiveness is policy prejudicial to the true interests of the Church of England nd ought to be discarded.

The underlying issue concerning the trial of bishops for heresy y such methods as the Bishops (Retirement) Measure seeks to mplement would ultimately deprive the Church of England of its ard-won doctrinal freedom. There are at the present time adequate neans for trying heretical English bishops. Such proceedings ave to be initiated with the consent of the Archbishop of Canterury in the Court of Arches. Should the defendant bishop in that Court be found guilty of heresy he has the right to appeal to the udicial Committee of the Privy Council in Causes Ecclesiastical, nd the decision of that Court is final. The decisions of that Court, owever (as recorded by Brodrick and Fremantle in their Judgments of the Privy Council [1]), exhibit such acumen and profundity hat no sound reason can be produced for replacing the present nethods of trial such as is proposed in the Bishops (Retirement) Measure.

It may be objected that the present methods of trial for heresy re very expensive, and should the prosecutor fail to secure a onviction he would have to pay very heavy costs. This is really strong argument in favour of the present method as it discourages the initiation of such prosecutions unless there are very owerful reasons for them. On the one hand, no well-wisher of the Church desires to see it rent asunder by such prosecutions, nor, on he other hand, no lover of truth and tolerance desires to see earless truth-seeking bishops suppressed by such facile and emi-secretive proceedings as the Bishops (Retirement) Measure roposes to sanction.

We hope that when the Bishops (Retirement) Measure comes up for discussion by the Church Assembly in June next this objectionable clause will be deleted. If, however, it be not deleted, hen we trust that the measure itself when it comes up for sanction by the House of Commons will be, in the interests of religious freedom and toleration, decisively rejected.

[1] See *Hibbert Journal*, April, 1948: 'Criticism and Conscience' by H. D. A. Major.

THE THREAT TO LIBERAL THEOLOGY*

By the Rt. Rev. E. W. Barnes, D.D., Sc.D., LL.D., F.R.S.

WE are passing through a great era in the growth of knowledge, a second Renaissance similar to that which reached its climax in the sixteenth century. This vast change of ideas, an almost overwhelming enlargement of outlook, must profoundly affect religious belief. The first Renaissance led to the Reformation out of which the Church of England, as we know it, emerged. Our present Renaissance already has made necessary a new Reformation, a restatement of belief in harmony with new knowledge. Those Christian theologians who see this need and are painfully working towards it are sometimes known as Modernists, though I myself think it better to use an older term and to call them Liberal Churchmen.

Some observers outside the Church think that the change of ideas has been so vast that the Christianity of the Church of England is already out-of-date; and the idea gains strength from the fact that there has been no substantial change in our authorized statements of doctrine for several centuries. Other observers go much further. Arnold Toynbee, for instance, writes of the present as a post-Christian era of Western civilization. I personally am convinced that all such estimates are mistaken. Christianity contains within itself profound religious truths and can to-day be so presented as to command the assent—nay more, the veneration—of well-educated men thoroughly trained in history and science.

But vast numbers of educated people have left the Church. Probably a majority of its active members are elderly, with the mental inertia of age. Intellectually active young people are repelled by services and sermons in which statements of belief are repeated — such, to take an extreme example, as that the world was made in six days — which they cannot accept.

We are in a most difficult position. Those who remain enthusiasts for the Church, clergy and laity alike, are too often theological reactionaries strongly opposed to change. Yet without theological change the Church will perish. It already shows disquieting signs of decay.

Now there are a number of clergy and laity profoundly distressed by the situation. They are seeking to forge for themselves and to present to others a reasonable faith, to convince the world, for instance, that in order to be a Christian you need not believe in Adam and Eve. These liberals, like most pioneers, are

* Address by the Bishop of Birmingham in Birmingham Cathedral, Sunday, February 27th, 1949.

loughing a hard furrow. If they are parish priests, disgruntled arishioners report them to their bishops in the belief that they re destroying, and not rebuilding, the faith. Many a bishop may ot so misjudge his clergy; but he wishes for peaceful progress: e is tired by administration, probably lacks the technical knowledge of science, history and theology involved in the disputes nat arise, and so, not of malice but of sheer weariness, shows no ympathy with his liberal clergy.

Clearly in the struggle of the new Reformation of the Church f England the influence of the bishops cannot fail to be important.

The reactionaries, if I may use the term without offence—they re well-meaning, if misguided men and women—naturally desire nat there shall be no liberal bishops. They wish to secure either nat no liberal bishops should be appointed or that, if by chance ne should be appointed, he should be capable of removal. But ishops are appointed by the Crown and cannot be removed save, robably, by the Crown in Parliament.

It is generally agreed that to take away the Crown's right to ppoint bishops would mean the disestablishment of the Church f England and therewith a substantial measure of disendowment. he question was discussed a few days ago in the Church ssembly. Some members would like disestablishment — none esire disendowment.

But if the Crown continues to appoint bishops, of whom a ery few may be liberal theologians, the reactionaries desire power o remove them. Such power cannot be obtained without a change n the law; and for such a change Parliament must accept a neasure sent forward by the Church Assembly.

Now, obviously, if a measure to 'liquidate liberal bishops' was ent to Parliament, it would be unhesitatingly thrown out. The ouse of Commons has little interest in the Church of England, ut it is profoundly interested in religious freedom; and any ttack on religious freedom in the State Church would fail, if its ntention were perceived.

So it is proposed to send forward a measure bearing the innoent title *Bishops* (*Retirement*) *Measure*, 194- (No. 2). This neasure has been on the stocks for some years. An early form roposed that action might be taken against a bishop in respect of social and political opinions.' That has been wisely dropped. Until last week it was also proposed to drop the possibility of ction against a bishop in respect of questions of doctrine. This ecision has now been reversed, to the great anxiety of liberal lergy everywhere.

If the measure in the form now to be brought forward passes through Parliament, a small cabal of bishops could by a simple majority bring before a tribunal, consisting only of bishops, some liberal colleague of whose views they disapproved : that tribunal could try him, say that his views made his retirement necessary or expedient, and thereupon the Archbishop could declare his bishopric vacant.

He would have one safeguard : the declaration could not take effect until confirmed by the King in Council. But the tribunal might direct that all the evidence should be heard in private and the condemned bishop might be made to pay all the costs.

You will probably not believe me when I say that all this could happen to a man for expressing disbelief in Jonah's whale or Noah's ark. Our unrevised formulae are so out-of-date that we are expected 'unfeignedly to believe all the canonical scriptures of the Old and New Testament.'

You may say that no liberal bishop would ever be brought to trial for such ridiculous offences. That is true : the particular disbelief would be carefully chosen so as to secure the maximum amount of public sympathy for his condemnation.

You may also say that the King in Council would never affirm such a condemnation. That is probably true. But think of the position of a liberal bishop formally condemned by his brother bishops, holding a bishopric which after the trial the Archbishop had declared vacant : his position would be impossible. Those who seek to imagine the position should read the history of the Colenso trials for heresy in the middle of the last century.

So far, during the years in which this astonishing measure has been under consideration, controversy has been kept underground. Obviously, the more fully the House of Commons realizes what the measure means, the less chance there is of its passing.

It would, I conceive, be disastrous if the proposed measure were to be passed. The independence of the bishops of the Church of England has seldom been dramatically exhibited — though all know of the famous trial of the Seven Bishops in the reign of James II — but their freedom has often been quietly influential. I know of no case where this independence, and especially freedom from doctrinal control, has been abused. At times a particular bishop may have seemed to be trying too rapidly to adapt his teaching to the needs, intellectual or social, of his age. His action, because of his office, will always have been taken with a sense of deep responsibility, and for this reason in the end has been justified by events.

In this era of turmoil we liberal Churchmen must not allow a great tradition of fearless freedom to be destroyed. All over the world the right of free speech is under attack. All over the world religious truth is menaced by repressive action. We must resist the entrance of such a menace into our own Church.

I regret to have to speak in this way. My primary interest is in religion. I study theology earnestly as the handmaid of religion. I find ecclesiastical politics most distressing. But we are now fighting what seems to be a desperate battle for liberal theology in the Church of England. I ought not to keep silent.

WILLIAM TEMPLE

By the Rev. J. S. Bezzant, B.D., M.A., Canon-residentiary and Chancellor of Liverpool Cathedral

NONE questions that the latest successor of St. Augustine to die in office was a great Christian, a great Churchman, a great man. In many respects his life was marked and shaped by good fortune, which now deservedly includes his biographer.[1] Though the Dean of Lichfield modestly describes himself as an 'elderly amateur who is suddenly called upon to write a book,' his success has been fully and rightly recognized. To have sifted and digested such a vast mass of written material and to have produced this large book in so relatively short a time was a laborious and formidable technical task; but the achievement is not to have lost the man in the recital of his many varied interests and ceaseless activities. Few can have been in contact with all sides of Temple's life but a very large number had personal experience of some of them; yet no one has complained that in this book he has not met again the man he knew. And though Dr. Iremonger writes in a clear but rather colourless style, eschews panegyric, and has applied the late Lord Oxford and Asquith's disputable dictum that 'the true biographer is not a judge,' few will read his book without realizing that its subject was greater than they knew.

There is a Temple genealogical tree going back to Leofric, Earl of Mercia, but its reliability and William's place in it are uncertain. His immediate forbears were less distinguished, on the paternal side, than either himself or his father. He was born in the episcopal palace at Exeter, where his father was Bishop, rather more than two years after his brother, Col. F. C. Temple, C.I.E., who preserved some seven hundred of William's letters,

[1] *William Temple, Archbishop of Canterbury: His Life and Letters.* By F. A. Iremonger. (Oxford University Press, 1948; price 25*s.* net.)

the permitted use of which has enriched this biography; they show, beyond doubt, that in the intimacy of family relations he was the same man as he appeared to others to be. The *Life* of Archbishop Frederick Temple discloses that his mother was a Cornish lady whose family owned and farmed land in the parish of Probus and traced its pedigree to Guy de Beauchamp, second Earl of Warwick. In due course Frederick Temple, at the age of fifty-four, married Beatrice Lascelles, the youngest child of the Rt. Hon. William Saunders Sebright Lascelles, a younger son of the Earl of Harewood and of Lady Caroline Howard, daughter of the Earl of Carlisle. Precise deductions from lineage are precarious, but it may be thought, from the nature of the outstanding qualities of the two Archbishops Temple, that the predominant influence in their immediate heredity was maternal, though the most important single influence in William's life was his father's. Like him, William was markedly devoted to his mother and did not marry until after her death, when he was thirty-five. Though he loved the young, he was childless, a fact which never seems to have clouded his personal or married happiness. Nor was his cheerfulness daunted by painful and often immobilizing gout with which he was from childhood afflicted, and which imposed periods of physical rest which otherwise he would certainly not have taken.

Temple's early letters show his natural commonsense and also the clear style, with its effective use of short words, which remained throughout his life. He left Rugby with this comment from his Headmaster:

> '. . . the extraordinary growth of his intellectual side in the last year or two. I think *anything* is possible to him, and he has throughout been a pattern to the House—manly, transparently sincere, loyal, strong.'

At Balliol he took good Firsts in Mods. and Greats but was never attracted by the minutiae of scholarship. By then he had already fully acquired his unusual gift of ready and lucid speech, his tutor noting, as others noted later, that at times it led him 'to think he had found a solution when he had found a phrase.' In 1904 he was elected a Fellow of Queen's, was ordained in 1908, and two years later, being then twenty-nine, became Headmaster of Repton. During these years he was already wanted everywhere and by everybody: the life of extraordinary activity and crowded engagements was in full swing. After little more than two years at Repton he was formally offered and accepted St. Margaret's, Westminster, with its Abbey canonry, whereon it was discovered that he lacked the statutory qualification of having been six years in Priest's Orders. Within two years he became Rector of St. James's, Piccadilly, and was heavily engaged in the work of the

ational Mission and then of the Life and Liberty Movement of hich he was throughout the driving force, eventually resigning s rectory in order to become more effectively its apostle and ader. When, in 1919, its immediate objective, the Enabling Act, as in sight Temple accepted a canonry of Westminster, the third e had been offered in six years, and in less than two years was nsecrated Bishop of Manchester in his fortieth year. Eight years ter he was translated to York and his tenure of that primatial e was much the longest time he remained in any appointment. ome doubted whether he would succeed Lang at Canterbury, as any of his recent speeches on social and economic matters had ot found favour in the then dominant political circles; but Dr. remonger is right in saying

> 'But it was impossible to pass him over . . . under any system of election or appointment, by Church or State or both, the choice would have fallen on Temple. No other bishop possessed in equal measure his many qualifications.'

he sadly brief period as Primate of All England began in 1942 nd ended two and a half years later, with a greatly more wide-pread and popular regret than had been felt at the passing of any f his predecessors.

Except that he was of medium height Temple was a large man n every respect—in mind, in body (he was stout from youth), in oice and particularly in his laugh. What he looked he was; erene (if breathless in activities never in himself), unfailingly ind and generous, accessible, incapable of more than momentary esentment and without a trace of pomposity. Probably the one ning he could not have done well, had it ever been necessary, ould have been to defend his own dignity. The basis of his oroughly integrated personality, which so enhanced his natural ifts, was undoubtedly his unruffled faith in God incarnate in hrist, to which he was absolutely dedicated, and consequently in e ultimate goodness of things; about this, while intellectually ware of the difficulties, he never seems to have experienced any rim or troubled doubt. This was also the ground of his immense elf-assurance and the explanation of its co-existence with a com-lete absence of conceit. In any cause he believed to be right he as never inhibited from acting with all his vigour by awareness at there was much to be said on the other side. He never allowed difficulty of deciding to be transformed into an evasion of deci-ion or into a difficulty of acting when once he had decided. The biding inspirations of his life were the Fourth Gospel, the poetry f Browning and the thought of Plato, and the greatest of these as *St. John*.

Temple's outstanding natural endowment was his inherited

gift of learning, and never forgetting, almost everything he read. At sixteen he was able to quote in an essay, with but one verbal slip, a total of 240 lines of Shelley. He suffered from congenital cataract and read only with the left eye, but his reading and learning were as varied and immense as those of most full-time professors. In his thirties he thought he was probably the only English clergyman who had read the whole *Summa* of Aquinas, but I have heard the same said of Rashdall and think A. L. Lilley had done likewise. He could draw on his stores of knowledge at will, lecture and speak several times a day without apparent effort, which he admitted to be the fact, and for seven or more successive days which allowed no more than a few minutes for preparation, and what he had to say could be taken down and published in book form without correction. His preaching and speaking were invariably mainly intellectual: at the beginning of a mission to Oxford undergraduates he remarked that if the promoters had wanted emotional appeals 'they would never have asked me.' His manner gave an impression of deep conviction and of one speaking with authority. It seems that as a diocesan bishop he was not a good judge of men and, among the modern episcopate, he probably shares with a former Bishop of London (Winnington-Ingram) the palm for admitting inadequate men into Holy Orders, though there are some close runners-up. The explanation offered — that he realized he ought not to judge others by his own standards, combined with a kindliness that could not say 'No' — is almost certainly the true one.

When an Archbishop bangs heavily upon a particular door it is a safe assumption that that door is already fairly widely open, and if Temple's social and socialist sympathies and utterances in later years gave offence in an opposite political quarter, and in other circles, they were nevertheless very widely popular and in harmony with a strongly flowing tide. But it should be remembered (and of the multitude who heard or read his views only because archiepiscopal pronouncements secure wide publicity few were aware of it) Temple had been expressing much the same opinions ever since, as a young don, he took a prominent part in the Workers' Educational Association; and such views were not then at all popular either in Oxford or among those upon whom his ecclesiastical promotion largely depended. Nor did he ever waver in or cease to proclaim his conviction that the real root of social problems is spiritual. He was often embarrassed by and protested against the tearing of his words upon economic and social issues from the religious context in which he almost invariably set them and from which, in his judgment, they inevitably followed. Before

is ordination he had made it clear that his political sympathies ere with Labour, and in 1919 he announced that he had joined hat Party; but he was disappointed with its Parliamentary chievements and its Far Eastern policy, and gave up his member hip after seven years. He continued to feel more sympathy with he Labour programme than with that of any other political party, ut thought that the Labour Party generally 'has conspicuous ifficulty in realizing that our first job is with the Gospel.'

Another absorbing interest was the promotion of closer relaons and co-operation with non-Roman Churches throughout the orld — the Œcumenical Movement, as it is now called. This he laimed to be something in our own time that is genuinely new. He took an increasingly large and eventually a dominant share in s conferences and work, and characteristically hoped for greater hings from it than at present it can easily be seen to promise. His activities in this sphere alone would have fully occupied an rdinary man with comparable official duties and responsibilities.

It is very widely thought that Temple in later life forsook the heological liberalism of his Oxford and Repton days for a more onservative and Anglo-Catholic position. Any careful study will eveal that there is more superficial ground for the assertion than ruth in it. The Church being what it is, an Archbishop, whatever is own ecclesiastical sympathies, cannot speak publicly in disegard of the effect of his words upon large bodies of churchmen f different sympathies. Nor ought he to do so. Like everyone lse, he may not rightly believe one thing as a man and proclaim nother as an official; but it is unrealistic to suppose that great ffice can have no proper influence upon a man's action and even pon his thought. It has long been recognized, not without ground, hat the most promising and potent cure for a pronounced tendncy to Evangelical churchmanship in an able and prominent man s to make him a bishop; without any further study, he is likely o begin to appreciate the Catholic doctrine of episcopacy. But a study of Temple's public pronouncements and the contemporary rivate letters shows that there is very little indeed in suggestions f a change in theological outlook or in churchmanship. He was ever an Evangelical in the ecclesiastical party sense of the word. As a Balliol undergraduate he thought that only 'a great Broad Church Movement' could save the Church of England, but it must be inspired by Scripture. At twenty-one it is 'the rational and practical' interpretation of the Bible that matters, and 'where thinking men differ from the Church, it is as likely as not that the Church is wrong.' At twenty-four, if he had to choose, he would prefer the authority of the Church to that of the Bible; and

thereafter the Church is ever the centre of the picture. If taken with full seriousness, belief in the Holy Catholic Church is the one article of the creed which will always tend to swallow up the others, and much else; and though it never did so in Temple's belief, it undoubtedly changed the balance. But it had done so *before his ordination*. True, the Bishop of Oxford (Paget) felt unable to ordain him, but it is clear that the cause of the hitch was the young man's words:

> 'I am inclined, very tentatively, to accept the doctrine of the Virgin Birth, and, with rather more confidence, that of the Bodily Resurrection of our Lord. . . . I am very conscious that my opinions are still subject to considerable change.'

But by 1908, when Temple was twenty-seven, Randall Davidson could tell the Bishop of Oxford that the rejected ordinand was

> 'in a far more orthodox *spirit*. . . . I myself regard him as being, *in all essential particulars*, an orthodox believer both in the Virgin Birth of our Lord and in His Resurrection . . . it is perfectly clear that his position with regard to matters of Faith is different now from what it was two years ago.'

Davidson felt no anxiety in ordaining him, and did so. That many of his friends were known to be Liberals, and that he contributed to *Foundations*, did much to encourage the belief that his main tendency was in a Modernist direction, but there is little or nothing in his essays to support this view.[2] He was entirely justified in saying that, with the possible exception of Neville Talbot, in positive doctrine he was in closer agreement with Ronald Knox than were any other of the contributors, though he held, as he continued to hold, that the position of Streeter and his colleagues was legitimately tenable by priests of the Church of England.

> 'I am ready, even eager,' he wrote to Knox, 'to insist that as enquirer I have not yet found all that the Church has found and in any divergence of judgment I bow to the Church for practical purposes (which includes preaching) unless I think I can see plainly that the Church is wrong. As a matter of fact there is no point where I do see this.'

The date is 1913. His Broad Church friends were then uneasy. It was only a year after Temple's ordination that Rashdall said to him:

> 'I used to be afraid that you would be too much of a heretic to be ordained: now I am beginning to fear that you will end up in the Pusey House.'

And in the following year, in dedicating a book to Gore, Temple wrote of him as the one

> 'from whom I have learnt more than from any other now living of the spirit of Christianity, and to whom more than any other (despite great differences) I owe my degree of apprehension of its truth.'

[2] It is noteworthy that his words before going to Repton encouraged an expectation of revolutionary changes. They did not happen.

e had doubts, not about the truth of the Virgin Birth, but about s rightful inclusion in the creed as an article of faith. Even these ere finally dispelled while he was still at St. James's, Piccadilly :

> 'He experienced absolute certitude of its truth — at a second of time during a symphony concert at the Queen's Hall — and from that moment his recurrent doubts, whether or not it should be included in the creed, were dispelled.'

r. Iremonger really should have been less reserved and have sclosed the title if not the particular chords of the musical com- sition which had the unusual power of inducing absolute certi- de of the truth of an alleged historical event. Such experiences e, of course, final for those who have them; but they are of no ore than biographical interest for others who desire grounds as ell as causes of belief.

Perusal of Temple's published sermons at the time of *Founda- ons* will discover nothing in them that an educated Anglo- atholic, not of Roman mentality, would regard as Modernist. It true that his sympathies with Tractarianism and its development ew with the years, but this did not displace or appreciably odify the degree of liberalism characteristic of him in the early ars of his ordained life. As late as 1938, there is nothing anti- beral in the Doctrinal Report in which he had a large part or in s Introduction to it. His personal statement of his position about e Virgin Birth and the Resurrection does not differ from the ews he expressed at the date of *Foundations* or of his ordination. n the other hand, as late as 1935, he writes that the Oxford ovement Centenary celebrations

> 'on balance have done, I think, more good than harm, which is exactly what I should say of the Movement itself.'

Near the end of his life he was aware of the contrast between s own position and that of 'younger Catholic theologians.' These ere and are no longer concerned with trying to make out a good se for Christianity by bringing it and contemporary knowledge nd thought into any real harmony, but rather with taking the aith as Divinely revealed and seeking to apply it to more practi- l present-day problems; in other words they are concerned rather ith usefulness than with truth. There is no arriving at this posi- on by a liberal approach: one reaches it by simply taking the aith for granted and by obscuring and dignifying the process by e name of 'a Divine gift of faith.' Temple tried to understand is newer phase. He was in no sense Barthian and he thought ese younger theologians were in danger of 'too hastily repudiat- g liberalism in the sense of a method of free enquiry.'

> 'A good many of us feel that the neo-Thomist group in their eagerness to re-assert the truth and authority of the Bible are ignoring the lessons of the nineteenth century and becoming involved in a position which is either obscurantist or humbug.'

Which is exactly what Modernists think. Temple strongly maintained his own position, but realized that the foundations would have to be taken deeper than they were taken in the pre-1914 and inter-war years :

> 'And we must be content with less imposing structures. One day theology will take up again its larger and serener task and offer to a new Christendom its Christian map of life, its Christo-centric metaphysic. But that day can hardly dawn while any who are now already concerned with theology are still alive.

Any marked change in Temple's theological and ecclesiastical attitude had taken place before his ordination. There was no later 'great swing to the right' because there was never a great distance to be travelled to it.

Comparing this biography with that of Randall Davidson there is a contrast between the part played by the two Archbishops in the inner affairs of State. Temple was, unfortunately, at Canterbury for a very short time, and had he lived his influence in this way might well have become large. But it was his energy and influence which were mainly responsible for one result which has affected the Church of England more than anything Davidson did — the Enabling Act and its outcome. None denies that the Church Assembly has passed some useful measures and effected needed reforms; but nothing it has made possible has extended the active membership of the Church or its influence in the life of the people. Nor is there need for the continuance of its activities at the present scale. It has greatly increased organization, commissions and committees, office work and expenditure, out of all proportion to the benefit to the main work of the Church. Axe-grinders and bores are now prominent in its debates. It has certainly not achieved the objects which its enthusiastic originators hoped for. 'Dick' Sheppard who, with Temple, was the inspirer of 'Life and Liberty,' came to despair of its outcome, while Temple's life-long friend and biographer, another early apostle, now prefers that a canon-residentiary should represent his chapter in the Assembly. There is no more life and less liberty. Moreover, its fruits have considerably added to the 'crushing burden of administration and of sheer relentless routine work' which falls upon his Grace of Canterbury, for the relief of which Dr. Iremonger adds his own earnest plea to the Bishop of Southwell's. An adequate administrative staff or secretariat at Lambeth is vastly more urgent than an inflated Church publicity department at a cost of £14,000 a

ear, the most egregious and wasteful proposal as yet brought efore the Assembly. But the suggestion of a G.H.Q. of the hurch at Lambeth 'devoted to planning and strategy' is another natter; it might well add to the Archbishop's burdens and issue in Canterbury Curia. What is needed is a realistic and searching nvestigation of the swelling centralized bureaucracy and its ever-nounting expenditure with a view to seeing how much of it could e cut out (*a*) with advantage and (*b*) without serious loss to the eal work of the Church in the parishes or to its influence upon the ational life. If the present decline in effective Church member-hip continues (and the Assembly can do nothing to arrest it) conomies will be unavoidable. But the machinery is now well stablished and its runners well dug in, and will take some shift-ng; if cuts have to be made, more vital interests are likely to be acrificed first.

In one important matter Temple's views did undergo a change. t the time of 'Life and Liberty' he was convinced that the hurch must win full power to control its own life and at the cost, necessary, of disestablishment and its consequences; and he nought this drastic step would have to be taken. A few years ater he could refer to disestablishment as a 'great calamity,' a uestion 'in which the Church need take no interest at all. It is a uestion for the State only.' Some of his statements on this sub-ect are not easy to reconcile with each other, but his earlier views, s he admitted, were completely reversed. He favoured the ppointment of the 1930 Church and State Commission and he nay well have been influenced by the evidence he heard as he sat n the right of the chairman, Lord Cecil of Chelwood. Nor can e have been unaware of the fact that his own utterances on natters which are the proper concern of the State received a pub-icity and exercised an influence far greater than they would have one had he been the Archbishop of a disestablished Church. The hange of attitude dismayed some of his friends, but there was no oubt about it:

> 'In his late years he became more and more convinced of the advantages to be gained by the State from its connexion with the Church'—those gained by the Church are more obvious and more real—'and this dominated his thinking to the end.'

The Dean of Lichfield invited and was fortunate to secure Professor Dorothy Emmet to contribute an estimate of Temple as hilosopher; her chapter is penetrating, sympathetic and just. A ew additional observations may be permissible. Philosophy, he hought as a young man, might be his vocation, but few will regret hat it did not prove to be. It remained an interest he could never bandon and he managed to read a surprising amount of it. His

Gifford Lectures, *Nature, Man and God*, form an astonishing production for a man who led his life, the more so as he reveals incidentally in a letter that each lecture took him about six hours to write in his own hand. The book covers a wide range and is much better integrated than his earlier *Mens Creatrix*; it reveals his wealth of diversified knowledge, much originality and independence, and constitutes an impressive defence of theism. Criticism such as other philosophers might offer is largely disarmed in advance by the frank statement of his method :

> 'All my decisive thinking goes on behind the scenes; I seldom know when it takes place—much of it certainly on walks or during sleep—and I never know the processes which it has followed. Often when teaching I have found myself expressing rooted convictions which until that moment I had no notion that I held. Yet they are genuinely rooted convictions — the response, not of my ratiocinative intellect, but of my whole being, to certain theoretical or practical propositions.'

He does not attempt to construct a philosophy by building step by step from 'certainties' as foundations. The alleged certainties, in his view, whether *a priori* self-evident premises or the facts used for analysis and induction by empirical philosophy, 'are bound to be abstractions.' Unfortunately he gives no reasons why this must be so.

> 'My own endeavour is rather to provide a coherent articulation of an experience which has found some measure of co-ordination through adherence to certain principles. The endeavour is exposed to perils of its own, because the experience may contain illusions, and the analysis can never be carried to an ideal limit; but so far as it is successful it has the advantage of contact with actuality at every stage. I do not claim that my method is the best, or only really sound, method of philosophical thought. But I claim that it is legitimate and that it has certain merits of its own.'

Among the facts which justify Temple's procedure is that all but a handful of mankind reach such conclusions as they hold by exactly the same but in a far less thorough-going way. Further, his own certainties, of which he could never divest his mind, included not only indubitable belief in God but also certain facts of the Christian revelation, and he held it to be no serious objection to his philosophic position if it were not fully consistent with any other which omitted those facts. Nor can religion postpone either belief or practice until philosophy has reached conclusions which would allow it to proceed on fully established grounds. Indeed, the justification of modern philosophy is in its methods rather than in its results, which seem to become more and more exiguous. To-day there is nothing that can be called an accepted influential philosophy with which it is a compelling task to integrate the formulation of religious belief; and the essential question is not about the methods or causes by which anything comes to be

believed, but whether there are sufficient grounds for the conviction of belief or faith that it is true. Temple was a *theological* philosopher.

Listening to his exposition of some difficult theme, even able minds were so deeply impressed by his conviction and clarity as to be almost persuaded; but they often went away with the feeling 'It can't be as easy as that!' The least satisfactory section of his Giffords is his handling of the problem of evil, which is of vital importance to his theme. His teaching about moral evil is not clear, due to an oscillation between more than one meaning of 'freedom'; and he almost by-passes the grave difficulty of physical evil and puts forward no adequate theodicy. People often got the impression that he did not appreciate this problem in its full gravity. He was by nature and by faith optimistic. He admitted he had had a big share of the things most worth having, and his biographer says that the note of tragedy was missing from his life. It is a matter in which confident assertion is wholly out of place, and I would only remark that if, as is claimed, a whole-hearted and serene acceptance of Christian faith draws the sting of evil and tragedy — and Temple had such faith in full measure — one can hardly at the same time account it a weakness or a limitation in such a man if he feels that sting less keenly than do those of frailer faith.

But there can be no doubt that, from the standpoint of psychology and epistemology, Temple's theological philosophy is open to the criticism that it is rather an able and eloquent exposition and justification of a system of personal convictions than reasoning designed to convince those who do not start with sharing his religious faith. There is good reason to believe that his intellectual pilgrimage was not completed when his life was unexpectedly and lamentably cut short; but of the stage he had reached the Swedish Bishop Brillioth writes:

> 'It could perhaps be maintained that the philosophical categories which he handled so skilfully did not further a really thorough-going analysis of fundamental theological principles.'

That acute observation might well prove to have an application in another direction than that which I take its author to intend.

PASCAL AND OURSELVES

By J. C. Hardwick, M.A., B.Sc.

IDEOLOGICAL wars, wars of religion, are fought with peculiar savagery and leave a particularly horrible trail of desolation and misery behind them. Such wars do not help those who indulge in them, for they usually end in a stalemate with both sides too exhausted and disillusioned to continue the struggle. Either side can only impotently hate the other. As for sensible men, they cease to be interested in the rival fanaticisms, devoting both equally to perdition.

In sixteenth-century France the Catholic Guises and the Huguenot Bourbons of Navarre indulged in civil war for seven years, and their hired mercenaries laid the country waste with professional thoroughness. When the shooting war began (the cold war had been on for some years) — in 1562 — one highly sensible man, Michel de Montaigne, was twenty-nine. As eye-witness of the political struggles and religious controversies of his countrymen, he held himself aloof from the current factions, adopting an attitude of scepticism. In his view one should be very sure that one was right before proceeding to burn alive those who held contrary opinions. Of course the trouble with the dogmatist is that he *is* sure. The St. Bartholomew massacre of 1572 must have confirmed Montaigne in his scepticism. He observed that in the religious wars God's cause alone would hardly be able to raise a single company.

As a matter of fact the 'scepticism' of Montaigne has been subjected by religious prejudice to some degree of misrepresentation. He was no Pyrrhonist declaring that everything was uncertain, a disbeliever in the possibility of attaining any truth at all. It was the concept of Nature that had significance for him — 'our great and powerful mother.' Montaigne's influence was widespread because he spoke to the condition of his time. The intolerance, anarchy, violence, cruelty and treachery displayed by the religious dogmatists disgusted those in whom a spark of rationality smouldered. Stoicism became fashionable, editions of Epictetus and other Stoic writers appeared, for Stoicism offered a philosophy of commonsense and reason, and was in keeping with the results of that scientific view of Nature which was already foreshadowed.

Many moved even further away from the traditional religion. In the century following, Mersenne, a close friend of Descartes, estimated that the number of atheists in Paris, a city of 300,000, amounted to 50,000; and though this figure was doubtless an

xaggeration, it may not have been too far out, for there is no moke without fire. The causes of this defection were probably wo — the advance of natural science, and the general disgust at he wars of religion and the 'exquisite rancour of theological atred' which displayed itself in assassinations and massacres. n the seventeenth century the Thirty Years War (1618-1648) urpassed in extent and degree the achievements of the previous entury in the spheres of ruthlessness, savagery and destructive- ess, the population of Germany being halved in the process. The products of such implacable strife are despair, cynicism, dis- llusionment, and a general collapse of ethical standards and of ll ideals.

Into this sea of troubles Blaise Pascal was born in 1623, and oon developed a precocious intelligence. His first work, com- osed at the age of eleven, was a treatise on sounds embodying he results of experiments designed to discover why the sound rom a china dish struck with a knife ceased when the finger was laced on the vessel's edge. Not long afterwards his father dis- overed him demonstrating to himself the 32nd proposition of Euclid's first book. In 1640, when he was seventeen, his *Essay on Conic Sections* was published. To help his father in the compli- ated business of computing the assessment of taxes which his ost as King's Intendant and Commissary necessitated, young Pascal devoted himself to the invention and construction of a alculating machine. It took ten years to perfect, and the labour nvolved the undermining of his never too robust health. His eally illustrious achievement, however, was his solution of the roblem of the vacuum. The traditionalist philosophers denied he possibility of any such thing in Nature, but Pascal, in his *Fragment d'un traité du vide*, expressed himself adverse to the ower of authority in science. The full treatise on the subject was ever finished, but,

> 'he was the first to make an absolutely conclusive experimental verification of what with others had been merely speculative conjectures, and he was the first to draw from his experiments an amazing variety of corollaries and practical applications, such as Pascal's syringe and the principle of the hydraulic press.' [1]

The fact that the Treatise on the Vacuum was never finished was due in part, perhaps, to a realization on his part that the solution of any problem, scientific or other, raises a set of fresh problems to which there is no end. 'Nothing restrains the current of the mind.' Neither his *Provincial Letters* nor the Apology for Christianity (*Les Pensées*) were ever finished, perhaps for the same

[1] D. G. M. Patrick, *Pascal*, p. 61.

reason. To write with confidence one should not see too far. To a man like Pascal nothing was simple; he saw things from more than one angle; his experience was too complex and his thought too penetrating. He resembled St. Augustine, for whom 'ordinary' things, like Time and Memory, raised a host of problems. Unlike the majority of physicists, and indeed of men of science in general, Pascal was not contented to take only one side of human experience into consideration. In his case this would not have been possible, for he was the recipient of a vivid, indeed soul-shaking, religious experience himself. No doubt it should be the aim of philosophy to attempt 'to attain a synoptic view of *all* experience and all knowledge,' but the difficulty is that the different sides of human experience, and the conclusions drawn from them, often seem to contradict one another, and the individual who cannot resolve these contradictions must either sacrifice a valuable segment of reality, or if he cannot bring himself to do this — as Pascal could not — he suffers acute distress from an inner division of the soul. This was the fate that Pascal suffered, and his poor physical health and continued nervous distress must be attributed in large measure to this cause, and not merely to overwork and a weak constitution. Had he been a physicist and mathematician only, interested in conic sections and the theory of the vacuum, he could have been reasonably happy and healthy. On the other hand, had he been only saint or pietist, he might have experienced the joys of a confident religious faith. But as it was, heart and mind were ever at variance, and his storm-tossed soul knew no peace.

For example, the idea of an infinite universe, the product of the new astronomy, appalled him, as it seemed to dwarf or abolish altogether the significance of human life; 'his soul grew faint at the realization of its own impotence.'

> 'When I consider the brief span of my life, swallowed up in the eternity before and behind it, the small space that I fill, or even see, engulfed in the infinite immensity of spaces which I know not and which know not me, I am afraid.'

And yet he saw how to exorcise this nightmare. In bulk man may be nothing; he is only a reed, but is a *thinking* reed.

> 'Were the universe to crush him, man would yet be more noble than that which slays him, because he knows that he dies, and the advantage that the universe has over him; of this the universe knows nothing. Thus all our dignity lies in thought.'

In this pronouncement the influence of Descartes is clear, for here we have the antithesis between *extended* matter and *non-extended* thought. But though in one sense Pascal may be

lescribed as a Cartesian, he was very far from that philosopher n one respect, *i.e.* in his attitude towards religion. The philo- ophy of Descartes included a proof of the existence of God, but, s Höffding has remarked, if he introduces the conception of God nto his theory of knowledge, he certainly has not God, in the eligious sense of that word, before his eyes. Though the philo- ophic adducement of proofs might under favourable circum- tances lead to theism, this would not be the same thing as to onfirm the demands of the religious instinct and to establish the xistence of the God of love — the one true God for the Christian eligion. For Pascal religion did not consist in the acceptance of hilosophic theism — deism and atheism were all one to him; eligion was 'the heart's direct experience of God' (*dieu sensible u coeur*). Philosophic theism would be 'at best a preparation, at vorst a synthetic substitute' for the real thing.

'What Pascal desires is to have his heart satisfied, and no ntellectual inquiry can help him to this,' remarks Höffding. here was first the desire for an infinite object with which to unite is feeling, and there was also that sense of dismay and horror vhich he felt (as we have noted) in finding himself in a universe vithout limits and without constancy, and with this was united his istress and concern at the situation in which men found them- elves, and the real greatness of Pascal lies in the insight which e had into the human situation and the lucidity and point with vhich he described it in brief notes and aphorisms. As a pre- iminary to his projected Apology for Christianity he collected hese thoughts (*Pensées*) on human nature and its conditions, evi- ently under the conviction that the problems of religion should e approached from the human end, and not from the side of *priori* speculations. 'So far from knowing what God is,' he eclares, 'man knows not what he is himself,' and he was stounded that so few seemed willing to examine the subject.

> 'I pardoned others their ignorance of (the abstract sciences). But I at least thought to find some companions in the study of man, because this is the study which is most proper to him. I was deceived: those who study man are even fewer than those who study geometry.'

What struck Pascal about human beings were the contradic- ions in their make-up, neither wholly beasts nor wholly angels.

> 'What a chimera, then, is man! What an oddity, what a monster, what a chaos, what a subject of contradiction, what a prodigy! Judge of everything, senseless earthworm; depository of truth, cloaca of un- certainty and error; the glory and refuse of the universe!'

here is certainly something extremely queer about the human ace, explain it how you will. Pascal as a devout Catholic, and

still more as a fervent Jansenist, attributed the astounding contradictions in man — his greatness and his misery, his dignity and infirmity — to the Fall. 'He is visibly astray and fallen from his true position, without power to recover it.' 'Who thinks himself unhappy because he is not a king, except a deposed king?' Man's situation is described by Pascal in words which he puts into the mouth of 'the Wisdom of God':

> 'Expect not either truth or consolation from man. It is I who have made you, and who alone can teach you what you are. But you are now no longer in the state in which I made you. I created man holy, innocent, perfect; I filled him with light and understanding. . . . He was not then in the darkness which now obscures his sight, nor subject to the mortality and wretchedness which now afflict him. But he was not able to support such glory without falling into presumption. He desired to stand alone, and to be independent of my help. He broke away from my control, and as he measured himself against me by desiring to find his happiness in his own being, I have abandoned him to himself. . . .'

One recognizes here the note which is being widely heard to-day in religious circles; for parallel circumstances produce parallel results, and conditions in the seventeenth century, *mutatis mutandis*, were not so different from what they are to-day. The Renaissance dawned with bright hopes, as bright as those of our own nineteenth century when trade was booming, and the goddess Progress was worshipped on all sides.

But the wars of religion spoiled everything in those days, as the ideological wars have done in ours. Man has been revealed to himself as a savage; the idealistic intellectual becomes a doctrinaire, and the doctrinaire is remorseless. The noble Brutus becomes an assassin. In the midst of this turmoil 'the theology of crisis' sprouts.

It is perhaps fortunate for Pascal's after-fame that his *Apology* was never finished, for it would have 'dated.' In his day, before the rise of biblical criticism, before anthropological studies had developed, and before Darwin had written, it was still possible, if not easy, to regard the Fall as an historical event. But his preliminary sketches, his *Thoughts*, dealing as they do with human nature as it is, still stand, and are as 'dateless' as *Ecclesiastes* or the Book of *Job*. An apology for post-Tridentine Catholic theology, stressing the more sombre aspects of Augustinian anthropology, would not have been of comparable value. One is inclined to wonder whether Pascal's failure to complete this work was not due in some measure to a fundamental scepticism. He was a diligent student of Montaigne.

> 'This is what I see and what troubles me. I look about me on all sides and see everywhere only obscurity. Nature offers me nothing which is

not matter for doubt and disquietude. If I saw nothing which denoted a Divinity, I should decide in the negative. If I saw everywhere the marks of a Creator, I should rest in peace in the faith. But seeing too much to deny and too little to convince me, I am in a pitiable condition, in which I have wished a hundred times that, if a God sustain Nature, she might show it unequivocally, and that, if the signs she gives of it are deceptive, she might suppress them entirely, that she say all or nothing, in order that I may see which part I should take.'

To see two sides of a question is not the best way, perhaps, to achieve successfully the rôle of an apologist. And yet it is true that it is not always the man who sees things clearest who sees most deeply into them.

But the interesting question for the present-day reader of the *Pensées* is how far this line of approach is useful to-day. And the reply to this would seem to be that any approach to a problem that recognizes the facts is likely, in proportion as it does so, to be useful. And Pascal assuredly did recognize the facts of human nature and of human life. And it is here, possibly, that our optimists and liberals of the nineteenth century went astray. It was not that they rejected the doctrine of the Fall of Man, which in its traditional form, and perhaps in any form, is no longer tenable. It was rather that they did not realize, or at least did not admit, the amount of frustration and sorrow that must exist even in the best regulated community — and of few human communities can it be truthfully said that they are regulated well. Nor did they recognize that you have not to scratch the civilized man very deeply before you find the savage, nor realize how strong and how predominant amongst us are some of the less attractive aspects of human nature.

When realizing these sombre facts, which we are better able to do than the more happily situated denizens of the period which came to an end in 1914, we cannot conceal from ourselves the limitations to which we are subjected. There is the inevitability of death, of struggle, of suffering, and also of guilt (for the best-intentioned people cannot avoid causing harm and grief to others); while civilized society is constantly threatened by the blind instincts of man. These things ought no doubt not to be, but that is neither here nor there. They are just facts. Take the case of death, a thing no one can avoid:

'It is a fact just like other facts, that the individual must die. Man may try to find consolation about his own end and that of his friends by considering the unending life of nature of which he himself is part; or else he may strive beyond the limits of his own individual existence to secure the permanence of certain values for which he lives. Yet, in experiencing the death of his closest relative or friend he sees at once the

> flimsiness of all these arguments; for he cannot follow him whom he loves. Something has gone for ever. Suddenly man feels his own insignificance and loneliness amidst a great empty space.' [2]

These limitations must be accepted as the conditions of our existence, and in contending with them a man grows and matures. But this acceptance by no means involves for us, as it apparently did for Pascal, any return to Augustinian or Calvinistic mythology. What it does involve is that sense of dependence which Schleiermacher declared to be the essence of religion. Man comes to feel that he is dependent upon an objective power by which his existence is determined.

Of course the question arises as to the nature of that power, *i.e.* whether it is rational and ethical or otherwise. That it is so is perhaps one of those presuppositions which, though incapable of proof, are nevertheless indispensable. Such presuppositions are necessary in science; we have to assume causation and the uniformity of nature.

The 'theology of crisis' is not the solution for us because it makes use of a formula — the Fall — which is contradicted by our knowledge of the past history of our race. Biologists and anthropologists reject it. Human beings are imperfect, but that imperfection is not to be accounted for by the sin of Adam. That is a mistaken diagnosis, and unless the diagnosis is correct, there can be no cure.

The doctrine of a Fall has this to be said for it, that it was an attempt to account for sombre and lamentable facts. But its thought-form is no longer consistent with the view of the world that the sciences show us; it has therefore lost all relationship to the spiritual life of our time.

[2] Erich Frank, *Philosophical Understanding and Religious Turth*, p. 10.

JESUS CHRIST AND CHRISTIAN APOCALYPTICISM

By T. F. Glasson, M.A., D.D., author of *The Second Advent: the Origin of the New Testament Doctrine*

I

APOCALYPSES are of two kinds. The word means 'unveiling'; and some writings of this class claim to unveil the unseen world and let us into the secrets of heaven and hell; others unveil the future course of history and more particularly its climax. The former type is an adventure in space, the latter an adventure in time. Both types are found among Jewish apocalypses, but those concerned with the future appear to predominate, such as *Daniel* and the *Similitudes of Enoch*. Generalizations are difficult, but it is probably true to say that Christian apocalypses have concentrated more on the topography of the unseen,[1] the greatest of this type being Dante's *Commedia*.

One reason why the Church has not produced many apocalypses concerning the end of the world is that the ground is covered so well in the book of *Revelation*. Christians felt that their task lay in the direction of interpretation rather than independent creation. The pages of *Revelation* are sufficiently cryptic to provide plenty of scope for the ingenuity of their interpreters. Christian apocalypticism has therefore centred upon this book — and this in spite of the fact that its position in the canon has never been secure. It is well known that while it was accepted early in the West, the Eastern Churches hesitated for centuries. At Constantinople its position was in doubt as late as the eleventh century. It never formed part of the Syriac Bible. At the time of the Reformation Luther placed it with a few other books in a separate division at the end of the Bible. 'My spirit,' he said, 'cannot acquiesce in the book.' According to Zwingli 'it is not a book of the Bible.' Of the books of the New Testament it was copied least of all: the evidence of the uncials and minuscules shows that the Gospels were (quite rightly) copied more than any other books of the New Testament. One of the misfortunes entailed by the invention of printing was that it became customary to print the whole of the New Testament (or the Bible) in one volume, so that *Revelation* received proportionately more publicity than had previously been the case, and all the books of the New Testament were thus given an equal circulation.

[1] See M. R. James, *Apocryphal New Testament*.

While *Revelation* is the only apocalypse in the New Testament, there are apocalyptic elements elsewhere in the Epistles and Gospels. The word 'apocalyptic' when used as an adjective is somewhat ambiguous; but any material which deals with the themes made central in the old apocalypses is apt to be called 'apocalyptic' — any attempt to map out the future in detail, or to describe some divine inbreaking of a cataclysmic kind. Similarly the word is used at times to denote the prevailing mood of the apocalypses, their concern with the future and their utter despair about the present, their conviction that the end of the age is imminent and the day of dramatic deliverance is at hand. In this wider sense, apocalyptic elements may be traced in a number of passages in the New Testament, *e.g.* the description of the apostasy and the Man of Sin in *II Thess.* ii. Again, *Mark* xiii and its parallels in *Mt.* and *Lk.* belong to this category; these passages, indeed, present what is usually known as the Little Apocalypse. This brings us to the question of the attitude of our Lord to this type of teaching.

II

Everyone would agree that Jesus had nothing to say about the topographical details of the unseen. But what of the other kind of 'apocalypse'; is this represented in His teaching? Here opinion is divided, and some have sought to explain Him as an apocalyptic teacher. It is, however, significant that the passage just referred to as the most pronounced of this type in the whole of the Gospels (*Mark* xiii) is precisely the passage which is most likely to be secondary. In fact there is a wide measure of agreement that an apocalyptic pamphlet produced in the the early Church has here been combined with a few genuine sayings of Jesus.[2]

Apart from chapter xiii there are only two advent references in *Mark* — a fact to be noted by those who maintain that the thought of Jesus was controlled by the hope of a speedy return in glory.[3] Let us look at these two passages. One is viii, 38: '. . . the Son of man also shall be ashamed of him, when he cometh in the glory of his Father with the holy angels.' Now the important thing to note is that we have a Q version of this saying reported in *Mt.* x, 33 and *Lk.* xii, 29; and 'in the Q version (which is probably more original) there is no reference to a "coming" of Christ.'[4]

[2] For a recent discussion see Vincent Taylor, *Expository Times*, January, 1949. On the Lucan version cf. T. W. Manson in *Mission and Message of Jesus* (ed. Major), 621 f.

[3] A significant fact, too, for those who say that to query the advent teaching is to shake our whole confidence in the Gospels!

[4] A. M. Hunter, *St. Mark* (1948), 91. See also C. H. Dodd, *Parables of the Kingdom*, 93 f.

The remaining reference in *Mark* which is often regarded as an vent prophecy is xiv, 62 : 'Ye shall see the Son of man sitting the right hand of God and coming with the clouds of heaven.' his reflects *Psalm* cx, 1 and *Dan.* vii, 13; in the former God in- tes 'my Lord' to sit on His right hand; in the latter 'one like to a son of man' approaches the Ancient of Days and is given minion and glory. In both passages the idea of enthronement represented. *Lk.'s* version (xxii, 69), which is probably from a n-Marcan source, omits the coming with clouds. But both *k.* and *Mt.* (xxvi, 64) begin with the phrase 'from now' (*Mt.*, *'arti*; *Lk.*, *apo tou nun*); in *Mk.* also this phrase is found in the naitic Syriac and in one MS. of the Sahidic version. It seems, erefore, that we must regard this as a symbolic saying.

> 'The term "henceforth" or "from now onwards" in *Mt.* and in *Lk.* would seem to indicate, not some future apocalyptic advent of Jesus, but a progressive, spiritual ascendancy, beginning with His crucifixion—the equivalent of the Johannine "now is the Son of Man glorified" (*John* xiii, 31). "From this very moment," Jesus would seem to say to His High Priestly judge, "I shall become, as you will see, the supreme, moral and spiritual judge of mankind.' (H. D. A. Major.)[5]

It is clear that Jesus reinterpreted the conceptions of Messiah- ip and the Kingdom of God, combining the former with suffering d martyrdom and speaking of the latter as already in the midst men. What they had been awaiting for centuries had now rived (*Lk.* x, 23-4; xi, 20; xvii, 20-1). At the same time, the ingdom had not come in its final form; it had arrived in the nistry of Jesus in its initial stages and further developments re to follow His Crucifixion — as indeed they did. This helps to understand *Mk.* ix, 1 (the Matthean parallel, xvi, 28, intro- ces the advent): 'Some of those listening to him, says Jesus, ll not experience death till they see God's rule (already present Jesus and his mission) come with power . . . *i.e.* signally and umphantly — a prophecy which came true in the Resurrection, e Gift of the Spirit, and the victorious expansion of the Church er Pentecost.'[6]

No attempt can be made here to examine all the Gospel evi- nce; but in doing this we should apply the commonly accepted inciples of Gospel criticism. Thus (*a*) where *Mt.* and *Lk.* are oducing *Mk.*, it is wise to attach most importance to the arcan form; (*b*) the interpretations now attached to the parables ıy be expansions of the original words of our Lord. The

[5] *Mission and Message of Jesus*, 181. The same interpretation is given A. M. Hunter (*St. Mark*, 137) and others.

[6] Hunter, 91.

striking thing is that when we apply these and similar tests (which were originally arrived at without any thought of eschatology), the apocalyptic element is seriously affected: *e.g.* compare *Mk.* xiii 1-4 with *Mt.* xxiv, 1-3; the former deals with the Temple; the latter adds references to the *Parousia* and End of the Age — two expressions peculiar to *Mt.*; *Parousia* only occurs in *Mt.* xxiv in all the Gospels.

On the whole subject of our Lord's attitude one would agree with John Macmurray in saying that there is 'little ground for thinking that Jesus expected in the near future a catastrophic intervention by God, of a miraculous kind, by which the kingdom of heaven would be established. Such an idea would be counter to the whole tenor of His life and teaching.' In fact the idea of progress, continues Macmurray, which is totally foreign to the Greek and Roman mind, had its origin in the teaching of Jesus.[7]

But how, it may be asked, are we to account for the situation in the primitive Church? The early speeches in *Acts* do not reveal any expectation of a speedy end of the age[8]; but the Epistles, particularly *I Thessalonians* iv, show that it was not long before this expectation came to hold a prominent place. And it is not difficult to understand how this came about. The spirit of apocalyptic expectancy which existed in Judaism at this period (as evidenced for instance by John the Baptist) was carried over into the Church. Jesus' interpretation of the Kingdom was so different from anything men had expected, and His Messiahship was of such a strange kind, that the early Christians felt that the events they had witnessed could only be the prelude to the real thing; instead of seeing that Jesus had *transmuted* their hopes, they *projected* them into the future. Other factors would contribute to the hope of some new interposition in the near future, such as our Lord's reference to the lifetime of the apostles, the prophecy of Jerusalem's fall within a generation, the taking over of the Jewish Antichrist doctrine — all this would tend to encourage a spirit of great excitement and anticipation, precisely the temper revealed by the Thessalonian letters.

It was natural that this spirit of expectancy should link itself with the Old Testament descriptions of the Day of the Lord, and it is to these that we must turn to find the origin of the pictorial

[7] *Clue to History* (1938), 104.

[8] There are five elements (and no others) common to all these speeches: 1, the fulfilment of the Old Testament promises; 2, the death of Jesus; 3, His resurrection; 4, the forgiveness of sins; 5, the apostles as witnesses. The same five factors (and no others) occur in *I Cor.* xv, 3 ff.

tails so prominent in the advent teaching of the New Testa-nt.[9] We can thus account both for the spirit of expectancy and e advent imagery without modifying what was said earlier con-rning the teaching of Jesus.

It is of great interest to notice that while Paul began with this te of apocalyptic expectancy, he did not remain at this stage. If read his letters in chronological order, we find great develop-nt in his thought on these subjects. In *Romans* he appears to pect that the final consummation will not take place until the ws as a body turn to Christ (xi, 12, 26).[10] But later still comes e noble epistle to the *Ephesians* in which a great process of re-nciliation through Christ is envisaged. God's purpose is 'to sum all things in Christ' (i, 10), and in this process the Church is is instrument. Even now the barrier between Jew and Gentile s been broken down, and finally harmony in the whole universe to be achieved. Paul had come to see that the true manifestation the power of God was the Cross (*I Cor.* i, 18-25). It is instruc-e to observe how in his writings fervent apocalypticism recedes d the great message of a spiritual kingdom centred in the Cross adually comes to the fore. This final message of Paul is in har-ony with what we find in the Fourth Gospel. Here it is made ain that the real 'inbreaking' of the divine into the world has eady taken place in the Incarnation.

But meanwhile the apocalyptic tendency still flourished and ached its final expression in *Revelation*. This work and *phesians* seem to exhibit two incompatible views. (*a*) According one, God's main activity is looked for in the future; at present e earth holds only the seeds of sin and judgment; the Christians ve nothing to expect from men but martyrdom; it is after the eat cataclysmic intervention that the Christian hope for the ture of the world will be fulfilled. (*b*) According to the other, od is even now engaged in working out a purpose in the world; e existing community of the Church is a proof of His reconciling ace and the organ of His activity. One can hardly hesitate in ciding which is the nobler conception and which is more in har-ony with the character and ways of God as revealed in Christ.

[9] The evidence for this may be found in my book, *The Second Advent: the rigin of the New Testament Doctrine* (1945; 2nd ed. 1947). It was of urse quite a familiar usage in the early Church to apply to Jesus O.T. ssages about God. The development of the advent imagery sprang from e conviction that Jesus was Lord, not (as has been thought for many years) om the conviction that He was Messiah. The view that the advent doctrine as a transference to Jesus (or an assumption by Him) of what had been edicated of the 'apocalyptic Messiah' breaks down through lack of evidence.

[10] Cf. the fine treatment of Paul's philosophy of history in C. H. Dodd's *omans*, 148-188.

III

The two tendencies represented by *Revelation* and *Ephesians* continued in the following centuries; and the struggle we can trace in Paul's thought has been perpetuated in the history of the Church. Clement of Alexandria and Origen preserve the more hopeful message and look for the triumph of the Christian faith on earth.[11] But in the West the mood of *Revelation* and its chiliasm had more influence. The millennium, as a literal period of the reign of Christ and His martyrs on the earth, was a part of the Christian message as expounded by Justin, Tertullian and Irenaeus. Papias particularly thought of it in most material terms, and said expressly that it would be a reign of Christ bodily upon earth. Cf. Lactantius: 'Mille annos inter homines versabitur.' Lactantius also said concerning the millennium that 'the nations shall not utterly be destroyed but some of them shall be left to be triumphed over by the just, and subjected to perpetual slavery.' Some of these early millenarians applied the prophecies of *Isaiah* lx, 10-13 and lxi, 5 quite literally.

It was Augustine (following Tyconius) who broke millenarianism as far as the main Christian tradition was concerned by interpreting *Rev.* xx as the period between the two advents. Jerome, too, took a similar line and wrote, 'Let us have done with this fable of a thousand years.' Augustine maintained that Satan was bound at Christ's first coming; the thousand years may refer to the last thousand of the present era, or to the whole time that the world was to continue (C.D. xx, 7).

Another apocalyptic feature even more strongly entrenched than chiliasm was the Antichrist legend. Bousset has shown that an earlier Jewish doctrine supplied a number of details which are only hinted at in the New Testament.[12] 'This tradition is in great measure quite independent of the New Testament, and in all probability dates, as far as its sources are concerned, from pre-Christian times.' Augustine, while rejecting chiliasm, retained the doctrine of Antichrist; at the end of the age, he wrote, 'Elijah shall come, the Jews shall believe, Antichrist shall persecute, Christ shall judge.'

The two traditions of a literal millennium and of Antichrist meet again in Joachim of Floris (1145-1202), and it was largely through his writings that chiliasm revived; it has been active ever since. Bousset points out that with Joachim a period arrived in

[11] For other Greek fathers in this connection see C. Dawson, *Progress and Religion*.

[12] *The Antichrist Legend*. See also his articles in *Encyclopaedia Biblica* and *Encyclopaedia Britannica* (still retained in 14th ed.).

hich eschatology, and above all the expectation of the coming of ntichrist, 'exercised a great influence on the world's history.' He aintains that lines of connection can be traced from the visionary ranciscans influenced by Joachim to Matthias of Janow, Wycliffe nd Luther. It is interesting to note that when Richard I was at lessina in 1190 on his way to Palestine he sent for Joachim, hose words to the king included a striking interpretation of a assage in *Revelation*:

> 'There are seven kings; five are fallen (Herod, Nero, Constantius, Mahomet, Melsemut), one is (Saladin), one is not yet come (Antichrist). Saladin at this time oppresses the Church of God, and keeps possession of it with the sepulchre of our Lord, and the holy city Jerusalem, and the land in which the feet of our Lord stood. But he shall in a short time lose it. Antichrist . . . is already born in the city of Rome, and *will be elevated to the Apostolic see*. And concerning this Antichrist the Apostle says, He is exalted, and placed in opposition, above all that is called God.'

he king's reply shows a surprising knowledge of eschatology and s a revealing comment on the thoughts of that time:

> 'I thought that Antichrist would be born in Antioch, or in Babylon, of the tribe of Dan; and would reign in the temple of the Lord, which is in Jerusalem; and would walk in that land in which Christ walked; and would reign in it for 3½ years; and would dispute against Elijah and Enoch, and would kill them; and would afterwards die; and that after his death God would give 60 days of repentance, in which those might repent who should have erred from the way of truth, and have been seduced by the preaching of Antichrist and his false prophets.'[13]

The methods of Joachim were taken up with enthusiasm by all who had anti-papal tendencies. Later the idea that the papacy was a manifestation of Antichrist passed into Protestantism; but he Reformers did not adopt chiliasm, which was branded as a udaistic heresy by the Augsburg and Helvetic Confessions.[14] It evived, however, in England, where the writ of the continental onfessions did not run, and was later revived in Lutheranism hrough the work of Bengel. It has flourished during the last two enturies and a number of sects specially devoted to adventism ave sprung up.[15]

Several unfortunate features have resulted from this apocaypticism. Not only has there been an emphasis upon judgment

[13] The conversation as reported by Rover de Hoveden is given in E. B. Elliott's *Horae Apocalypticae*.

[14] R. H. Charles' *Studies in the Apocalypse* (1913), 30.

[15] During the last 100 years, a 'dispensational' and chiliastic scheme (first propounded by J. N. Darby, founder of the Plymouth Brethren) has had an enormous influence, particularly in America; it is adopted in the Scofield Bible, of which there are millions of copies in circulation. An excellent account is given in *Prophecy and the Church* by O. T. Allis (1945).

and retribution, but an attitude of pessimism has been encouraged. The doctrines of Antichrist and inevitable apostasy have at times stifled the spirit of hope and blinded men to those divine forces which even now are at work in the world. Thus Cyprian wrote: 'The day of pressure is even over our heads, and the consummation of all things and the coming of Antichrist doth approach.' Gregory: 'All things that were foretold are accomplished; the king of pride cannot be far off.' Bernard: 'What remains but that the man of sin be revealed?' Many similar statements (all of which proved to be mistaken) might be given. Even Augustine's suggestion that we were now living in the millennium did not sound particularly optimistic.

Any hopeful conception had to come to terms with *Revelation*, since this was regarded as an inspired forecast of the future. One ingenious way in which this difficulty was surmounted must now be mentioned. This important development seems to have been initiated by Daniel Whitby (1638-1726), Precentor of Salisbury. Unlike Augustine, he maintained that the millennium was future and interpreted it to mean a glorious state of the Church. The fall of Antichrist meant the final collapse of Roman Catholicism, which would be followed by the conversion of the Jews and a flourishing period of spiritual triumph, peace and plenty. Now, as an interpretation of *Rev.* xx this was inaccurate; but the significant point is that a way of exegesis had been found which made room for a glorious instead of a dismal future.

The idea of a spiritual millennium, a triumph of Christianity on the earth, was taken up by others (*e.g.* Vitringa). A few years later we find Jonathan Edwards, the famous Calvinist of Massachusetts, describing in superlative language the approaching advance of the Gospel and the latter day glory of the Church. Edwards' *Call to Prayer* (1748)[16] explains the coming of Christ in *Rev.* xix as a great revival and a mighty progress of true religion leading to the golden age of peace and righteousness; all the Old Testament prophecies of the Messianic bliss will then be fulfilled, as will Christ's parable of the leaven.

> 'Instead of the few true and thorough Christians now in some few countries, every nation on the face of the whole earth shall be converted to Christianity, and every country shall be full of true Christians.'

Two facts should be noted:

1. This new spirit of hopefulness is connected closely with the modern missionary movement. The 'Call to Prayer' was taken up in this country by a group of Baptists in the Midlands, and it was from this circle that William Carey emerged, whose work in

[16] To be found in Vol. II of his 'Works.'

India proved to be the spearpoint of the new missionary advance.[17] The hint thrown out by Joachim that to find Antichrist we must look to the papacy made it possible to anticipate great advance after the expected collapse of Rome. This and a spiritual interpretation of the millennium opened up a more hopeful attitude to the future. It is rather ironical that by these strange and tortuous devices the book of *Revelation* played a part in the call to world-evangelism and the challenge to pray and hope for a Christian world!

2. It should also be observed that this belief in the final conversion of the world and in the 'progress' of the Gospel had no connection with Victorian optimism or evolution or the French *philosophes*. It is often forgotten that two hundred years ago men like Edwards in America and Wesley in England were describing in glowing words 'a Christian world,' which they believed would one day be realized through the power of God as manifested in the Gospel of the Cross and exercised through the reconciling ministry of the Church.

IV

At the present time the apocalyptic mood is very prevalent within the Church. While the childish dreams of the millenarians are not fostered except in fundamentalist circles and adventist sects, a temper of despair is characteristic of much Christianity especially among certain continental schools. H. Asmussen writes:

> 'As long as it is the message of the churches that this home (the world) shall be made as beautiful as possible through ethical action, so long are we tools of secularism. . . . It would be a better confession of faith if the churches said to the world and to the heathen: We wait. . . . I will remain as one who waits. For I have a gospel, good news. I await the resurrection of the dead and the life in the world to come.[18]

Surely one can believe in heaven and immortality and at the same time work and pray that God's will may 'be done *in earth*.' No one would accuse Dante of secularism, but he wrote *De Monarchia* as well as the *Commedia*.[19]

It is time that the Church abandoned the gloomy mood of apocalypticism and recovered faith in a divine purpose which cannot fail. It is true that no earthly consummation can satisfy the human soul or the race. But it may nevertheless be true that God has a plan for the earth as well as for Heaven. Science tells us

[17] The links are traced in E. A. Payne's pamphlet, *The Prayer Call of 1784* (1941).

[18] *Zwischen den Zeiten.* Quoted in R. Niebuhr's *Nature and Destiny of Man*, Vol. II, 203.

[19] Cf. P. H. Wicksteed, *Dante and Aquinas*, 220.

that the earth will probably be habitable for at least 2,000 million years. The Church must adapt its outlook to this new time-scale and see its task within a vaster framework. This is an unfinished universe and God calls for our co-operation and creative activity in bringing it to its completion.

The belief in automatic progress by the mere lapse of time has gone for good. But those who hold the faith that 'God was in Christ' are surely warranted in looking for great developments to follow from this central fact of human history. Those who believe that the living Lord is still in the midst of His people can never abandon themselves to despair even in days such as the present when the very foundations of civilized life are being shaken. 'The city of God remaineth'; and although human civilizations may continue to rise and fall, there is one movement which can never be destroyed, one kingdom whose increase cannot be arrested, a divine purpose whose ultimate fulfilment is sure.

A PROPHET TO DISPLACED PERSONS

IT is not without significance that Victor Hugo, the greatest of French visionaries, could compare Ezekiel with Homer, Aeschylus and, curiously enough, Juvenal. The poet, we are frequently assured, is a prophet—though one wonders if Elijah would have recognized the claims of some contemporary aspirants to his mantle. The prophet, we would rather urge, is a poet, and this principle is fruitful for the study of the prophetic books of the Old Testament both as regards their literary analysis and their religious interpretation.

Divine truth is mediated through poetic images, as the recently published Bampton Lectures for 1948 are concerned to show. The ability to objectivize an experience is the peculiar gift of the creative artist, whose greatness springs from the intrinsic value of the experience itself and the technical skill with which it is placed on permanent and intelligible record. Yet intelligibility is a relative term, and a vision of such intensity as to preclude coherent statement through any medium to the multitude may sometimes by the recipient be communicated to a kindred spirit. Simplicity is neither a test of artistic excellence nor of religious truth; complexity, on the other hand, is no indication of profundity.

The prophet is best understood as a creative artist on the highest level; he can no more be explained away than can his humbler brothers the musician, the mathematician, or the statesman. Timelessness is a quality of great art, and thus of the highest prophecy. The messages of *Jeremiah* and *Isaiah*, rightly understood in the light of the Christian revelation of the interpenetration of the earthly and the heavenly, are eternally valid, although the product of the interplay of particular personality and particular environment. Yet Ezekiel was a child of his time to a degree not shared by his colleagues in the prophetic tradition; he refuses to be separated from his 'Exilic' background, and it is by no means the least of the problems attaching to the study of the book which bears his name that interpretation demands an understanding of a religious and historical setting of which far too little is known with certainty.

The middle of the millennium B.C. was an age of the utmost importance in world history and religion, comparable, Prof. S. A. Cook maintains, with the first century A.D. 'From Athens to the Pacific,' wrote H. G. Wells, 'the human mind was astir.' One thinks at once of Confucianism and Taoism in China, of Jainism and Buddhism in India, of the Orphic movements in Greece, and

of the rise of Ionian speculation. The centre of world dominion, too, was moving west. Most important of all, in the light of subsequent events, against such a world background the Old Testament began to take shape and the Jewish nation to become aware of itself as the People of God. The *scandal of particularity* enters history.

The general acceptance by competent scholars of the results of that approach to Old Testament studies usually associated with the names of Wellhausen in Germany and William Robertson Smith in this country revolutionized earlier views of Hebrew political and religious history. We must refrain from pursuing well-worn paths, except to point out that, outside the prophetic writings, our Biblical accounts of the pre-Exilic era are deeply imbedded in the conditions of that age of reconstruction which, both in the *Diaspora* and, some would add, in Palestine itself, followed the destruction of the Judæan State in 586 B.C. The Palestinian population has ever been far from stable, its history a tale of tumults and migrations, voluntary and compulsory. Hardly less complex was the process of the formation of the *Diaspora*. We can only express our agreement with those scholars who contend that the impression of national solidarity and continuity in Palestinian political development, gained from the Old Testament accounts, is commonly overstated, to employ no stronger term. Our records present the entire process in relation to the highly specialized interests and experience of a particular community which, inspired we would urge, by the vision of Ezekiel, gained the ascendancy in Jerusalem in post-Exilic times. The climax of another attempt towards the realization of ideals we may perhaps see in the remarkable teaching of *Deutero-Isaiah*.

The pre-Exilic development of Hebrew religion is no less uncertain than the political vicissitudes, at which we have been able merely to hint. Again we can only state baldly our conclusion, highly debatable as much of the evidence is, that the religion of Israel in pre-Exilic times was very much of a piece with that of neighbouring territories. The ennobling influence of the more austere life of the desert wanderer is unmistakable (and must and can be explained from historical causes), and there is good reason to suppose that, at least in centres of culture such as Jerusalem, the indigenous religion was not utterly devoid of higher elements. But the grandeur of the Prophets of Israel is enhanced when it is realized that their efforts were revelatory; they sought to recreate the religion of their day, not simply to reform its morals. The Law and the Prophets are not to be sundered; both are of God. The

function of each is to lead men to a recognition of the other. The priest, man's chosen representative before God, is the minister of both, and yet may on occasion be identified with either.

Against such a political and religious background must be set Ezekiel. The Old Testament recognizes the Hand of the Living God guiding the destiny of His Chosen People, and for us in the twentieth century the abandonment of the doctrine of verbal inspiration does not necessitate a consequent abandonment of the Church's conviction that the Bible as a whole sets the scene for God's unique Self-revelation. Marcion, the 'most Christian of the Gnostics,' was in fact an illogical spinner of fantasies. In the light of the Incarnation features of the Old Testament are taken up into the New and shown to be types of eternal Truth. The magnificent solitude of Jeremiah in the midst of the collapse of all contemporary values expressed itself in that shattering awareness of God's Presence to each individual heart which all too easily becomes distorted into a glib and self-satisfied repudiation of institutional religion. Ezekiel's glimpse of the dawning of an age of reconstruction is presented to us transfigured into a vision of God's intervention to restore His Elect to the Holy City, to a life of ordered worship the fuller significance of which awaits the pen of the Christian seer for its expression.

In view of the complexity of the literary problems involved it is possible to refer only in the briefest manner to the theories put forward to account for the formation of the book of *Ezekiel* as it appears in the Old Testament. It should first be recalled that Semitic scholars of the stature of Cornill[1] and S. R. Driver[2] were evidently aware of no linguistic hindrances to the recognition of the work as a homogeneous whole. It is far otherwise with the more recent studies of Hölscher,[3] Torrey,[4] James Smith,[5] Herntrich[6] and even Herrmann,[7] all of which are most ably considered in that book of J. Battersby Harford[8] which F. C. Burkitt once described as the 'only piece of original Old Testament criticism done in recent years by an English scholar.' (G. A. Cooke's large commentary[9] appeared after Burkitt's death.)

The rejection of the Babylonian setting of the prophet's work assumes the necessity of the participation of a real (or imaginary) Ezekiel in the events presupposed by his oracles. Symbolic acts and frequent commands to 'speak' *YHWH's* words would, it is insisted, be valueless unless carried out in the presence of those for whose warning they were intended. But, as we have already argued, we are here concerned with a creative artist unable to stifle his own convictions, and not with the publicity agent of a reform movement striving to reach a large public. Even if we assume

that intercourse between Jerusalem and Babylonia was terminated by the events of 597 B.C., a serious objection to conclusions based on considerations of normal probability arises from a realization of *the abnormal* in the prophetic consciousness. That the mind of an Ezekiel could under certain conditions transcend spatial limitations is not to be denied outright. A scientific agnosticism is often a higher wisdom than a rationalizing ingenuity, and it is thoroughly uncritical for students to dissect the Biblical writings in accordance with *a priori* views as to what is or is not possible in the sphere of Divine Revelation with which, as Christians, we conceive the Scriptures to be concerned.

It seems likely, as Herrmann[7] suggests, that the book of *Ezekiel* consists of a number of independent utterances collected together, it may be, by the prophet himself. Some disturbance of the original text we may admit, but the chronological system and the easily recognizable framework of doom followed by restoration and Utopia, the whole executed with a precision thoroughly in harmony with the prophet's mentality, justify us in attributing the greater part of the book to Ezekiel himself, subsequent modifications being merely editorial and insignificant.

Ezekiel had the poetic gift of visualizing ideas as concrete images which he could project beyond himself. As in the case of all poets, the materials for his imagery were ultimately derived from external sense impressions, but the vividness with which he could create a situation and give it objective reality was remarkable.

His prophetic career opens[10] with a manifestation of the transcendent Majesty of *YHWH*. As Isaiah had sought[11] to set on record the experience of his Call in terms of the Temple service, and Saul of Tarsus could only speak[12] of a light from heaven and a voice, so the more precise mind of Ezekiel depicted a chariot of living creatures. Again, his reflections on the Temple at Jerusalem became for him the objective reality of a visit[13] to that Temple and of the visible departure[14] of the Glory of *YHWH* to 'the mountain which is on the east side of the city.' Samaria and Jerusalem appear[15] as Oholah and Oholibah; the exiles call to his mind[16] a startling vision of a valley of dry bones; the reversal of Israel's fortunes is presented[17] in the form of the carnage inflicted on Gog's host. An unusual precision of detail, a realism somewhat stark, and a remarkable power of detachment and objectivization are the outstanding features of the work of Ezekiel the poet. His thought is expressed in concrete symbols: Tyre is a ship[18]; Pharaoh Hophra is a crocodile[19] (an image not improbably derived from a cosmological myth, for the monster claims[20] to have created the Nile). Finally we are shown[21] a

ision of Utopia in that detailed picture of the restored community hich, we have suggested, was the inspiration of the all-important, perhaps small, group which laid down the lines along which ter Judaism was to develop.

It will be observed that such consideration of the prophet's tterances as essentially poetic is of immediate relevance, for it rows light on many problems concerning the composition and terpretation of the book of *Ezekiel*. It is no longer necessary o situate Ezekiel in Jerusalem in the presence of those for whom is message was intended. His consciousness of being *YHWH's* nvoy would be profound; his attention would be fixed on a rger community, though his immediate circle of listeners might e few. Distance would be of little significance; if he could ddress Tyre[18] and Egypt,[19] Judah need hardly be out of his nge. Possibly he was dimly conscious of primitive notions of ne objective reality of the spoken word and its effectiveness to lfil its mission. Certainly his acted signs would be regarded as ntributing to their own vindication, and not just as charades in ther dubious taste. Such ideas are not to be lightly dismissed. 'My word . . . shall not return unto me void, but it shall accomlish that which I please, and it shall prosper in the thing whereto sent it'[22] foreshadows the central doctrine of Christianity: 'The Word became flesh and tabernacled among us.'[23]

To his priestly descent and environment must be attributed in rge measure those qualities which distinguish Ezekiel among the reater Old Testament prophets. His thought was in terms of nat sanctified institutionalism with which Jeremiah, priest-prophet s he was, was impatient or unconcerned; his ideal a pure and rdered worship established in the holy city of Jerusalem.

Before all, his vision was of the transcendent otherness of *YHWH*; his experience, like that of Isaiah,[11] became a vivid cognition of the *totaliter aliter*. Yet his career as a prophet pened by the banks of the Chebar Canal with the realization that his Holy God was present with the exiles in an unclean land. Holiness in its primitive origins was ethically neutral, having a uality almost physical. It implied separation, not so much *from* he vulgar as *for* a god, and it was regarded as contagious; it must herefore be protected by elaborate restrictions. Its extension to nclude both physical and moral worth rendered sin a form of ncleanness, and indeed for Ezekiel the transgression of his eople, of which many among the exiles were assured by the fact f Judah's desolation, had consisted precisely in the confusion of he holy and the common,[24] until *YHWH* had been driven from His Temple.[25] Certain consequences followed. *YHWH's* own

people must be characterized by holiness, and at the end of his book[21] the prophet sets forth his dream of the ideal restored community, a dream which, we have urged, inspired a group to forsake the comparative security of life in Babylonia and an easy accommodation to the religion of the land in order to undertake the supremely difficult task of building a veritable City of God in the face of the opposition of the inhabitants of Palestine.

The royal house is ignored in Ezekiel's Utopia; the 'prince' is to be a figure of secondary importance,[26] and the 'David' of xxxiv, 23, 24 is an idealized vaguely Messianic figure (an echo of the later struggle between the civil and ecclesiastical power is to be recognized in *II Chron.* xxvi, 18 and *Zech.* vi, 9 f.). The priestly office[27] is confined to the family of Zadok (in *Deuteronomy* all Levites were eligible for priesthood), and the Levites[28] replace the uncircumcised aliens in the performance of subordinate duties in the Temple service. Ritual prescriptions are exacting, and the structure of the Temple itself and the apportionment of the land are ideally symmetrical. To such a restored and purified community, organized around its centre of worship, the Glory of *YHWH* returns.[29]

But the restoration of Israel is to take place not out of pity for the people,[30] but in order that the heathen should honour *YHWH's* majesty,[31] which the sufferings of His own nation had led them to despise. *YHWH* is Israel's God; His people have outraged His holiness, and lest they should think He overlooks their sin He punishes them by sending the Babylonians to destroy their defiled city-sanctuary and lead them into exile.[32] For other nations Ezekiel could imagine no other prospect than the forced acknowledgment of *YHWH's* sovereignty. Divine vengeance would fall on the proud luxury of Tyre[33] and the wickedness of Egypt,[34] and as a final manifestation of His might *YHWH* would restore His people[35]; the rout of the host of Gog[36] (identified by Hölscher with Gyges of Lydia) symbolizes the utter destruction of all who oppose His will. By a process almost automatic, the infringement of *YHWH's* holiness by impure worship,[37] political reliance on foreign support,[38] and social corruption[39] must bring about punishment of those responsible,[40] a punishment in which nevertheless *YHWH* Himself takes no delight.[41]

Meanwhile the True Israel in a foreign land must maintain a close brotherhood, strengthened by a rigid exclusiveness, and symbolized by the new significance attaching to Sabbath observance[42] (a custom of obscure origin) and the practice of circumcision[43] (in pre-Exilic days perhaps of social rather than religious import).

It is all too easy to condemn such exclusiveness, but it must e understood as an attempt to preserve from contamination a eritage rightly regarded as of unique importance and value. For ccording to the Pauline understanding of history it was in the niversalizing of Judaism, effected, in the Divine Economy of edemption, through the humiliatian and exaltation of Israel's Iessiah, that the Church, the New Israel, came to birth: 'Salva- on,' wrote[44] the profoundest of the New Testament writers, 'is rom the Jews.'

G. B. F. Cook.

Footnotes

[1] *Ezechiel* (1891)—but a *volte face* in later editions.
[2] *Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament* (9th edn., 1913).
[3] *Hesekiel, der Dichter und das Buch* (1924).
[4] *Pseudo-Ezekiel and the Original Prophecy* (1930).
[5] *The Book of the Prophet Ezekiel* (1931). [6] *Ezechielprobleme* (1932).
[7] *Ezechiel* (1924). [8] *Studies in the Book of Ezekiel* (1935).
[9] *The Book of Ezekiel* (1936). [10] ch. i. [11] *Is.* vi, 1-8.
[12] *Acts* ix, 3, 4; xxii, 6, 7; xxvi, 13, 14. [13] ch.xi. [14] xi, 23. [15] ch. xxiii.
[16] ch. xxxvii. [17] xxxix, 8-16. [18] ch. xxvii. [19] ch. xxix. [20] xxix, 3.
[21] chs. xl-xlviii. [22] *Is.* lv, 11. [23] *Jn.* i, 14. [24] xliv, 23. [25] xi, 22, 23.
[26] xlv, 7-17. [27] xliv, 15. [28] xliv, 10-14. [29] xliii, 1-9. [30] xxxvi, 32.
[31] xxxvi, 36, etc. [32] xxii, 15, etc. [33] xxvii, 26-36. [34] xxix, 3-12.
[35] ch. xxxvi. [36] xxxix, 1-16. [37] viii, 5-18, etc. [38] xvi, 26, etc. [39] xxii, 29.
[40] xviii, 20. [41] xviii, 23, 32. [42] xx, 12-24; cf. xlv, 17, xlvi, 1, 3, 4.
[43] xliv, 7. 9. [44] *Jn.* iv, 22.

AMSTERDAM'S TERTIUM QUID

By the Editor

THE year 1948 was memorable ecclesiastically for two world-wide religious conferences — one held at Lambeth, the other at Amsterdam; the one representing the Episcopate of the Anglican Communion, the other the inaugural Assembly of the World Conference of Churches. They both expressed the desire for Christian Fellowship characteristic of the twentieth century—the age of conferences, Christian and non-Christian.

The marvellously increased facilities for travel and the growing faith in the need for publicity and advertisement are no doubt largely responsible for this conference movement, but underlying it all is the longing for human unity based on the conviction — fatuous it may be — that the more we know of each other the more we shall love each other, and the equally fatuous conviction that the bigger a movement is, the better it is. Emerson's nineteenth-century faith, 'to be but one but to be with God is to be in the majority,' is laughable in its simplicity. What modern mind could prefer the waters of Shiloah which trickle softly to the roar of the Niagara Falls?

What have these two great conferences of Lambeth and Amsterdam achieved? Or, what do they promise to achieve?

So far as Lambeth is concerned, precious little. Considering the forces of reaction within the Anglican Communion, it is no surprise that Lambeth failed to go forward and has sought justification in the reflection 'He that believeth shall not make haste.'

When we turn to Amsterdam we note the same spirit — the desire for Christian unity and the realization that it was beyond the power of the World Conference of Churches to secure it at present. The Conference was quite unable to agree upon any practical policy. This its exponents and apologists frankly recognize. Their strength is *to sit still*, was Amsterdam's motto. The future is in the hands of God. All that Christians can do is to *witness* to their faith in Him and to wait upon Him.

The representatives of the older Churches, Orthodox and Anglican, at Amsterdam may have been satisfied with this conclusion, but the representatives of the younger Churches were not. Dr. Hartenstein notes this dissatisfaction in his trenchant article in the *International Review of Missions* (January, 1949):

> 'In Amsterdam we heard the voice of criticism from the younger Churches . . . the younger Churches of Asia and Africa . . . sought guidance and clarity for their concrete needs: the working out of the relations of the Church to nationalism and syncretism, to a new, ethical

disciplining of life, on the burning question of Church union and for all the practical problems confronting a branch of Christendom which, though still without traditions and without history, must find its way through all that threatens it to-day. "Amsterdam was not realistic enough," was the criticism that was loudly voiced among the younger Churches.' (p. 87.)

would appear that after Amsterdam these younger seekers for actical help retired to Bossey and conferred among themselves ere, but with what result we know not.

The self-satisfaction of the representatives of the older nurches as they look back on Amsterdam is represented by the ystical enthusiasm which inspires the Rev. Cecil Northcote's ticle in the *Congregational Quarterly* (January, 1949; p. 26):

'Amsterdam was an honest, rather matter-of-fact gathering. . . . To have said all that was said by an official gathering of Christians from all parts of the world, separated politically, divided theologically, committed to extremely divergent Church traditions but with the one overriding loyalty *in Christ,* is an event in history. This is the new thing, the fresh gift of life. What Amsterdam said in words, however, may pass on into the limbo prepared to receive such offerings, but the mind and spirit which thought and spoke are already enriching our common life.'

We observe that at the conclusion of the Amsterdam Assembly r. John R. Mott was appointed Hon. President of the Central ommittee. We wonder what his reflections were. Half a century o we heard Dr. Mott in his first world tour on behalf of the C.M. address the students of the University of New Zealand on he world won for Christ in this generation.' His conviction en expressed was that if the members of the universities could converted to the Christian Faith the conversion of the world to nristianity would speedily follow. To-day, notwithstanding all e work done by the Christian Churches in university extension China, Chinese Christians constitute only one in every thou-nd of the native population!

Obviously something has gone wrong, or rather something re-sed to go right. Was it that in those early days of the S.C.M. the ovement fell into the hands of fundamentalist and traditionalist nristians, and as a consequence the S.C.M., although creating in e colleges small centres of Christian piety, yet failed to exercise y converting influence on a large scale in the university world? reinterpretation and a new presentation of the Christian Faith the light of the modern outlook was demanded as a preliminary d accompaniment of the Student Christian Movement, but in ose days it was not forthcoming. To-day it is far otherwise, anks to the educational campaign initiated by Dr. Hunter, the esent Bishop of Sheffield, when he was Editorial Secretary of e S.C.M., 1913-1920.

As we read, so far as they are available, the reports and papers[1] of the Amsterdam Assembly, it seems to us that Amsterdam was in about the same stage as the S.C.M. was, some fifty years ago. There was plenty of enthusiasm, a strong feeling of fellowship, much expression of mystical devotion, perfervid oratory, but no convincing agreement on a presentation of the Christian Faith capable on the one hand of uniting the many divided Churches and on the other hand capable of converting the increasing multitude of educated men to a comprehensible, practical and convincing Christian Faith. In short, Amsterdam failed to unite in securing that spiritual, moral and rational ascendency needful for the conversion of mankind.

Much was said at Amsterdam about the Church and the Churches. This was no doubt inevitable, as the Assembly consisted of the representatives of some one hundred and fifty Sectarian, Confessional Churches; but the basic recognition that the Gospel of Jesus is the Gospel of the Kingdom of God, not the later developed doctrine of dogmatic ecclesiasticism, seems to us never to have been squarely faced, yet it is in that Gospel alone that Christian unity can be recovered and Christian converting influence supremely realized to-day.

What the nature of God's Kingdom is : where it is to be sought and found : how it is to be realized and extended : and the function of the Christian Church and Churches in this sphere, depends absolutely on the right answer to the question, What is the Gospel of the Kingdom of God which Jesus proclaimed and for which He died? It is the usurpation by the Confessional Churches of the Crown Rights of the Kingdom of God that Churchmen of all descriptions need to realize and repent of to-day. The Kingdom comes first—men are called to enter it and become its sons. When that call is obeyed fellowship and converting strength ensue and Confessional differences are transcended, outmoded and finally eliminated.

The Confessional Churches must begin their unifying ministry by proclaiming liberty to their captives and bidding them seek freedom and fullness of life in the Kingdom of God. These Confessional Churches never seem able to forget themselves and miss

[1] *The Message and Reports of the First Assembly of the World Council of Churches.* (S.C.M., 1948; 3/-.)
Amsterdam, 1948. By H. G. G. Herklots. (S.C.M., 1948; 2/6.)
The Congregational Quarterly. (Independent Press, January, 1949; 2/6.)
The International Review of Missions. (January, 1949; 3/6.)
The Expository Times. (T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh; December, 1948; 1/3.)

opportunity of identifying themselves with the Kingdom of od, whose servants they ought to be rather than the servants of eir ecclesiastical organization.

In his inaugural address Professor Barth assumed the rôle of alaam addressing Balak and the Princes of Moab. If the ssembly did not tremble at his word at least it must have felt nsiderably disconcerted. He came to bless, but having read the eat accumulation of preliminary literature prepared for the idance of the conference he was moved, if not to curse, at least criticize. His prophetic utterance may be summarized thus: 'ut away all self-assurance: avoid all shibboleths, ignore con-issional loyalties, wait upon God, put your trust in His word, ialize that He does not need your co-operation in advancing His ingdom upon earth. That Kingdom comes when He wills and w He will, and He does not need your help: your part is to itness, watch, wait.'

Dr. Barth's address reiterated, as we might expect, the Gospel Eschatological Apocalyptic Barthianism which he identifies th the Gospel of Jesus. His Barthian Gospel seems to us to be aying the ball right into the hands of the foes of the Kingdom Jesus taught it. His Gospel of the Kingdom demands *the co-eration of men* if it is to be realized on earth, and according to sus it is the Divine Will that that Kingdom should be realized earth, else why the petition in the Lord's Prayer: Thy King-om come on earth as it is in heaven? It seems to us that until this arthian eschatological apocalypticism be cast out the Christian nurch must remain paralysed. An example of this spiritual aralysis is seen in Professor Barth's treatment of the problem of e celebration of Holy Communion at Amsterdam. He pro-unced his verdict as follows:

> 'It would not yet be possible, in the stage we are now going through, for us to have here one common celebration of the Lord's Supper. It will perhaps not be possible for a long time to come. We might properly have made that evident by celebrating *no Lord's* Supper here. But we may not properly make it evident by celebrating separate Lord's Suppers, here of all places. Here we may be an imperfect congregation of the one Lord with heavy but with good consciences. But no blessing and no promise can rest upon us if we now deliberately reject here with one hand what we try to grasp with the other. Now we shall have to win and assert freedom for our one Lord Jesus Christ *in spite of* these divided Lord's Suppers.' (*Congregational Quarterly*, p. 13.)

o at Amsterdam they did not have a united Lord's Supper.

How precisely does the World Council of Churches conceive of self in relation to Christendom as a whole? Of course it must cognize that it constitutes only a minority of the Christian world,

CHURCH DIVINITY SCHOOL OF THE PACIFIC LIBRARY

yet it does not regard itself as a mere congeries of Christian Sectarian Churches. Neither does it regard itself as a new Church.

The Primitive Christian Church conceived of itself as the new race or new religion, or, better, as both combined. Thus Christians spoke of themselves as the third race, neither pagan nor Jewish. This third race conception, exhibiting itself in the form of a third way of approach to the solution of modern problems, spiritual and moral, dominated the utterances of Amsterdam. Dr. Hartenstein thus describes it:

> 'There was nothing of the rival polemics which characterized many deliberations in the old days. Nor was it a matter of being moderately irenic, after the manner of recent conferences.' . . . The Amsterdam discussions 'discovered, rather, just that third approach in which contrasts and tensions were openly expressed for the sake of truth, but *within* the oneness of the mystical Body of Christ.' (*International Review of Missions*, January 1949, p. 79.)

It is claimed that this third way method liberated the Amsterdam treatment of problems from the dominance of Confessionalism. But the prime question is not so much liberated *from* what as liberated *for* what? Was it for the spirit of truth, freedom and love of the Gospel of the Kingdom of God as essentially presented by Jesus Christ? What does Amsterdam mean by the phrase '*within* the oneness of the mystical Body of Christ'? Does it mean the fellowship of all who profess and call themselves Christians, or does it mean some Barthian restriction of the Church of Christ? Dr. Hartenstein seems to visualize this danger when he writes of the refusal of the Church of Rome and the Church of Moscow to be represented at Amsterdam. Moscow, because it would not dissociate itself from the Communist State, refused to go to Amsterdam. Rome, because it identified itself with the Kingdom of God (which Dr. Hartenstein asserts it has ever done since the days of St. Augustine, p. 80), refused to go to Amsterdam.

On this point Dr. Barth's definition of the Ecumenical Movement (given in his inaugural address) which Amsterdam ought to seek to realize is of great importance to our understanding of Amsterdam. He described it as

> 'that movement away from every ecclesiasticism towards Jesus Christ, without which Christians of different origin and different species cannot talk with one another at all, nor listen to one another, still less come into union with one another.' (p. 14.)

If Amsterdam is resolved in its Church policy to substitute for loyalty to the Confessional Churches, loyalty to the Kingdom of God and its principles as we have them given to us in the Gospel of the Kingdom taught by Jesus, then a real advance of

nspeakable value has been made in the way of Christian Reform, evival and Reunion.

To-day the bondage of Confessionalism or Churchianity is the reatest opponent to the recovery of Christian unity. To recover at unity we must go back to a stage in the religion of Jesus before e Church was organized. Cast out the bondwoman of Church rganization and Confessionalism, for the son of the bondwoman nnot be heir with the son of the free woman.

We hope we have not misinterpreted this as the real contribu-on of Amsterdam to the Reform, Revival and Reunion of hristendom.

THE MODERN CHURCHMAN'S BRAINS TRUST

QUESTIONS for the Brains Trust should be of general interest. They should be written on a postcard and sent to he *Modern Churchman's* Brains Trust, The Vicarage, Parting-on, Urmston, Manchester.

uestion.

What lies behind the doctrine of Reincarnation? Is it a truth or merely hypothesis? If the former, why is it ignored by the Christian Churches? am told that the Roman Church treats it is an open question. Is this true?

nswer.

The doctrine of reincarnation is most commonly associated with the huddist doctrine of Karma. Karma is an ego which is the resultant of one's ctions but does not share one's consciousness. The Karma is also the link etween 'me' as an incarnate phenomenon and a succession of past and uture phenomenal selves. The desire to reject an eternity of personal iffering — the Bhuddist equates existence with suffering — and the desire to ave the moral stimulus of the belief in a future life, lie behind the Bhuddist octrine. But it fails to give rational satisfaction to either of these desires. n the one hand, I cannot regard the man who inherits my Karma as lentical with myself or be in any way interested in him, while my connection ith the 'man' whose Karma determined my character and predestined my rcumstances seems to be quite arbitrary. Between one reincarnation and nother there is cause and effect, but one reincarnation has no personal esponsibility for the circumstances of the reincarnation of the same Karma.

The Bhuddist doctrine does not allow of any empirical evidence being duced in its favour, since by definition there can be no memory by one carnate 'self' of a previous incarnation of its Karma. It therefore can ever be more than a hypothesis. But on all questions of eschatology only peculative answers can be given, *i.e.* only hypotheses can be put forward, nce no one remembers his birth, let alone any existence before birth. Certain henomena such as the consciousness of some persons of having been in a lace before, although they are visiting it for the first time in their lives, eem to indicate the possibility of pre-existence. It is possible to suppose that

we are in this life phenomenal selves of transcendental egos whose disruption began the cosmic process and whose harmonization will complete it. Psychology tells of dissociated personalities and divided selves. We are all aware of the dreaming self which seems to have no connection with the waking self save in a brief and fleeting memory. Memory is the means by which we find identity with our past selves, but the chain of memory is often broken by sleep and by forgetting. In actual fact it seems as if it is the relative stability of our environment and our 'self' rather than our memory which preserves our identity with our past, and it is therefore not unreasonable that changes so revolutionary as birth and death should appear to sever the link of memory, at any rate temporarily. Also the comparatively brief span of earthly existence perhaps allows it to make no more impression upon the ego than a dream makes upon the waking self. These, however, are no more than speculative and unproved hypotheses.

The Christian Churches have ignored the doctrine of reincarnation because the scheme of Christian doctrine places the emphasis on the notion of original sin and the judgment, and views this life not as a horror from which to escape but as a scene of redemptive action. Bhuddism is a world-refusing religion: Christianity is world-accepting. Resurrection rather than immortality is the predominating note of Christian eschatology. The idea of reincarnation does not find an appropriate place in the picture of the judgment which the Christian has inherited from Jewish apocalyptic. The early Fathers — among them Origen — entertained notions of the reincarnation of the soul, but the doctrine was condemned in 540 A.D. The Roman Church abides by this decision, and indeed could not do otherwise without impugning its teaching and practice concerning purgatory. H. C. SNAPE.

Mr. Snape seems to me to have answered the questions put by the questioner. The doctrine is, of course, an hypothesis rather than an ascertained truth. It is an hypothesis designed not so much (as a scientific hypothesis would be) to account for empirical facts, as to make out a case for believing in a universal justice whereby everyone gets his deserts, neither less nor more, in the long run. As the *Book of Job* points out, the evidence supplied by human life on this planet here and now hardly bears out the theory of universal justice. The individual does not invariably get what we can regard as a fair deal. The Christian doctrine of rewards and punishments in another life is another way of straightening things out. Whether we actually have any secure grounds for believing that the universe *is* run on lines of what we call ideal justice is a problem everyone has to decide for himself. Perhaps this is just one of those presuppositions which we feel bound to make but of which no definite proof is available. J. C. HARDWICK.

I am in agreement with the decision that reincarnation is not a Christian doctrine, in the sense that it does not fit into the Christian scheme of salvation. That scheme does not teach that the process of human salvation will be prolonged through a series of human existences in this world. 'It is appointed unto men once to die and after that the judgment' (*Heb.* ix, 27).

Reincarnation also seems to conflict with the note of urgency in the evangelical call: 'Now is the accepted time; behold now is the day of salvation.' On the other hand, as has been pointed out above, Origen entertained the doctrine of reincarnation, and Origen was a very great Christian and did immense service to the Church of his day, both by his teaching and by the nobility of his character, and a number of his pupils became very influential Christian leaders; therefore one hesitates to call anti-Christian any doctrine which he taught.

In Christian theology there are three permissible theories of the origin of ach human soul:

1. Traducianism, *viz.* that the human being derives his soul from his arents as he derives his body from them. Traducianism is the acceptable iew to-day as it fits in with biological evolution.

2. Creationism, *viz.* that the Divine Creator by a special creative act pro-ides a soul for each human body. This is the general belief in the Greek)rthodox Church.

3. Pre-existence, *viz.* that spirits already in existence in the spiritual world ıay have existence in human bodies assigned to them for purposes of discip-ne, education, redemption. Those who believe in the pre-existence of souls ill have no difficulty in believing in the possibility of reincarnation.

Many years ago I read a book entitled *Fallen Angels* — by one of them. could not discover the name of the author, but the volume contained a emarkable collection of extracts from the writings of distinguished people xpressing their belief in their own pre-existence. Sir Walter Scott, a very ıne Christian, was one of them, but, of course, Wordsworth's Ode 'Intima-ons of Immortality' is the *locus classicus*:

> 'The soul that rises with us, our life's star,
> Hath had elsewhere its setting,
> And cometh from afar:
> Not in entire forgetfulness,
> And not in utter nakedness,
> But trailing clouds of glory do we come
> From God, who is our home.'

hakespeare, however, in Hamlet's soliloquy would seem to have had no elief in the reincarnation of those who have passed into 'That undiscovered ›untry from whose bourne no traveller returns.'

Reincarnation has no place in the Gospel of Jesus Christ (*Jn.* viii, 56, 58 ıd *Jn.* xiv, 2 cannot be cited in support of it), and where the whole theme is ›eculative it is no duty of the Christian Church to teach it.

H. D. A. Major.

BOOK REVIEWS

F. D. MAURICE: A PROPHET OF THE KINGDOM

The 'debunking' of the Victorian period is no longer so fashionable as it was fifteen or twenty years ago. For one thing, there is plenty to be 'debunked' nearer to hand by those who have a mind to do so. The nineteenth century has now receded sufficiently into the past for a more reasoned appraisal of it to be attempted. Even its architecture is beginning to be appreciated, and there is a marked revival of interest in Victorian theology. Works on Newman, Kingsley and Maurice have appeared within the last year or two, and now Dr. Vidler has given us a further study of the last of these in *The Theology of F. D. Maurice*.[1]

To his contemporaries Maurice was something of an enigma and their estimates of him differ widely. Julius Hare acclaimed him as the greatest mind since Plato; Kingsley habitually referred to him as his 'dear Master.' Leslie Stephen, on the other hand considered Maurice to be one of the most 'muddle-headed, intricate, futile persons' he had ever studied, while Jowett, though admitting his greatness, thought him 'misty and confused,' and none of his books worth reading. To-day it is as a Christian Socialist that Maurice is primarily remembered (though the modern Socialist would be grievously shocked by his complete disbelief in Democracy), and for his doubts regarding everlasting punishment. But theology, in its widest sense, was what he felt to be his true concern, and it is as a theologian that Dr. Vidler presents him in these pages. For the most part Maurice is allowed to speak for himself, so that here we can study his own throughts upon a wide variety of subjects, arranged in orderly fashion, together with Dr. Vidler's comments upon them.

After reading this book two things become clear: Maurice's essential greatness, and a realisation of why so many people have been puzzled by him. He was, as Dr. Vidler says, 'a seminal theologian, a generative thinker.' (p. 22.) But he was neither always clear nor self-consistent, nor can he 'be acquitted of seeing "everywhere his favourite ideas".' (p. 45.) For example, it was only this facility, together with an electicism which he, of course, would equally have denied, that enabled him to retain an almost fundamentalist position with regard to biblical criticism. Dr. Vidler skates lightly over his rupture with Colenso (of whose real greatness he shows as little appreciation as Maurice himself did), after the latter had begun his work on the Pentateuch. But nothing reveals more clearly than this episode the confusion which existed in Maurice's mind, for it was from Maurice himself, far more than from anyone else, that the Bishop had learnt the principles which underlay his criticism. No wonder then if Maurice caused confusion to others with 'his almost perverse antagonism to those with whom he should have been found in agreement and his enthusiastic support of those who were embarrassed by his approbation'.[2]

Certainly Maurice cannot be reckoned a Broad Churchman without reservation. He himself repudiated any such name. In fact much of his greatness lies just in this, that he stands as a protest against excess of party spirit, of system and over-organisation of every kind. 'What he would have us do,' says Dr. Vidler, 'is to concern ourselves not with parties but with principles' (p. 91)—

[1] *The Theology of F. D. Maurice*, by Alec R. Vidler, D.D. (S.C.M. Press. 8/6. Publication date, February, 1949.)

[2] G. L. Philips. in *Laudate*, June, 1946 (quoted by Vidler, p. 9).

ınd the chief of these principles is that of Christ's universal Kingship, the subect of his first great book, and that to which he constantly returns. Maurice vas a prophet of the Kingdom ; therein, most of all, lies his abiding greatness.

> 'The Gospel of Jesus Christ,' he wrote, 'the Gospel as He called it of the Kingdom of Heaven — does profess to show why the life of man is not vanity, and how it becomes vanity. The life of man, so the Gospel declares, is not vanity, for it is derived from the life of the Son of God. He is the Lord of everyman. In Him is Life, and His Life is the light of men. The life of a man becomes a vain show just because he does not confess his relation to this Foundation of Life ; just because he seeks that life where it is not to be found — in the things which he is to rule, not in the Lord who rules him.' (p. 43.)

That 'the proper constitution of man is his constitution in Christ', (p. 41) vas Maurice's root conviction. This was the point from which he started, he sin or fall of man, but Christ 'the Head and King of our race'. His heology is thus the very antithesis of that of Karl Barth whom Dr. Vidler uotes as saying (p. 47) 'Just because Christ is born, we have to regard the vorld as lost in the sight of God'. Maurice is ready to cap even such a paraox as this, for of Barthianism he would have held the same opinion as he eld concerning the Evangelical revival — 'that it made sinful man and not ıe God of all grace the foundation of Christian theology' — an opinion which ıight well commend itself to such lovers of paradox as exponents of the crisis theology'.

> 'We are,' says Maurice, 'not to think that the world was created in Adam, or stood in his obedience ; for the Scriptures . . . teach us that it stood and stands in the obedience of God's well-beloved Son ; the real image of the Father, the real bond of human society and of the whole universe, who was to be manifested in the fulness of time, as that which He had always been . . . Here is the express image, not shown in the heavens above, not in the earth beneath, but in a man . . . In Him we find how humanity is a holy thing, though each man felt himself to be unholy.' (p. 52f.)

The Christ-Spirit, then, dwells in everyman, and 'the condemnation f everyman is that he will not own the truth'. (p. 56.) For the truth is that there is a Divine root of humanity, a Son of Man, whence all the good in hurchman or man of the world, in believer or unbeliever, springs — whence othing but good can spring. Each right and true man has had some grace, enoting him to be of divine origin. In (Christ) dwelt that fulness of grace and lory, of which these were the scattered rays'. (p. 55.)

What, if this be so, is the meaning and purpose of Christian Baptism? aurice replies :

'Those who are baptised into the Names of the Father and of the Son ıd of the Holy Ghost become the heralds of a common life and a divine Kingom to all nations. Our baptism is the simplest and fullest witness of a demption which covers and comprehends all who are not baptised.' (p. 111.)

'The language,' Dr. Vidler comments, 'which is true for all men is true the highest sense for the baptised. They are witnesses to all men how true is. Their profession solemnly declares that there is no light in any human ing but what comes from Christ, the Head and Lord of man.'

Against the Evangelical and Romanist-Tractarian theories of Baptism aurice protested strongly. The former left it uncertain whether any given dividual were a child of God or not, while the latter, so far from exalting aptism, 'seems to me utterly to degrade it and rob it of its meaning (by rning) a *sacrament* into an *event*. (It) supposes the redemption of Christ to

be exhausted by a certain gift, while the Bible represents it as bringing men into an eternal and indissoluble relationship '. (p. 109f.) Since none retain their baptismal purity, such a view becomes a mockery, an insult to God and a torment to man. (p. 107.) Maurice recognised that while ' ordinances serve to take truths out of the world of abstractions and bring them into contact with human creatures ' (p. 122), yet at the same time ' whenever any great spiritual principle has been strongly revealed to men, a material counterfeit of that principle has always appeared also '. (p. 109.)

Though clear in his own mind upon the real meaning of Baptism, he was a little unhappy about the Prayer Book language, especially about the words in the Catechism ' Wherein I was *made* . . . the child of God '. In a letter to Kingsley about this he wrote bravely, ' If the Catechism stand in the way of our acknowledging the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, concerning the state of men in the sight of God, the Catechism must go '. (*Life of F. D. Maurice, II,* p. 271.)

To-day, as Dr. Vidler observes, ' Wherever the parochial clergy foregather, the question of what is called " indiscriminate baptism " is being canvassed. But he pours cold water upon this popular agitation for baptismal reform. Our doctrine of baptism must be thought out afresh before a practical revision is attempted. And in any case :

> ' It is much easier to observe that the present custom is anomalous than to say what ought to be done to put it right. The newly fledged curate, upon his first encounter with the problem, may jump to the conclusion that the problem is quite simple and admits of a simple solution. What the Church of England must do, he may say, is to adopt the baptismal discipline of the Churches in the mission field, since England itself is now to all intents and purposes a mission field. None but the children of practising or communicant members of the Church should in future be baptized. This and similar things are often said, but little discernment is needed in order to see that the problem is further complicated. To call England a pagan country or a mission field does nothing to eliminate the difference between a pre-Christian and a post-Christian society. Any scheme for a strict, or even a rational, baptismal discipline for the Church of England is found upon investigation to involve the whole question of the Church's past, present and future relation to the national society, of which the question of " establishment " is only one aspect. In other words, the problem of what is to be done about baptism cannot be settled by itself. It will be possible to deal with it satisfactorily only as part of a general readjustment between the Church and society, and while this readjustment may be overdue there are few signs yet that the Church or the State or public opinion is ready for it.' (p. 95f.)

Maurice believed profoundly in the sacred character of the State as well as of the Church, for if man is indwelt by Christ all human society must be, in a sense divine. Therefore ' the State is as much God's creation as the Church '. (p. 184.)

> ' We cannot,' he says, ' reverence heaven or know what it is, if we do not reverence the earth on which Christ walked and which He redeemed. We cannot attain Christ's likeness, if we do not learn to care for England as He cared for Palestine, when it was in its lowest condition. We cannot hope in Christ for ourselves if we suppose that He is indifferent about the righteousness and the freedom of our nation.' (p. 189.) ' Assuredly, no man hath ever done good to mankind who was not a patriot.' (p. 190.) ' The union between Church and State . . . stands

upon no decrees or acts of parliament, but exists in the laws of society, in the nature of things.' (p. 192.)

The idea of a National Church is not opposed to that of the Church Jniversal. On the contrary, 'Each Church which puts forth the claim to)e a National Church is asserting that there can be but one universal Church, imited by no condition of time or of locality, the same in all countries and ıll ages, but adapted to the characteristics and needs of each nation within vhich it dwells'. (p. 200.)

'A National Church should mean a Church which exists to purify and elevate the mind of a nation; to give those who make and administer and obey its laws, a sense of the grandeur of law and of the source whence it proceeds, to tell the rulers of the nation and all the members of the nation, that all false ways are ruinous ways, that truth is the only stability of our time or of any time. It should exist to make men tremble at the voice of God speaking to them in their consciences, to tell them that what He is telling them will be proclaimed before the universe, that every deed which men wish to hide shall be brought forth into the clear and open day. This should be the meaning of a National Church; a nation wants a Church for these purposes mainly; a Church is abusing its trust if it aims at any other or lower purposes.' (p. 197f.)

'In this exalted sense,' writes Dr. Vidler, 'it is the office of the Church o educate the nation . . . But as time went on, Maurice had to acknowledge . . that this was not practicable under existing conditions in England. Owing o the sectarianism of Christians, the National Church was not in a position o do its proper work, and therefore the State had to provide for the educa- ion of the people as best it could.' (p. 198f.) From those who hold that it is mpossible to teach Christianity upon the basis of an agreed syllabus Maurice vould indeed have differed strongly.

'In our pulpits,' he said, 'we exhort our hearers to believe in a Person who is the Head of the human race. In our creeds we all join in the confession of Him. And then in the face of these traditions, exhortations, obligations, we wrap ourselves in our sectmantle, and say that unless we wear it we shall not retain any "distinctive" religious belief.' (p. 198.)

As already stated, Maurice had no belief in Democracy.

'Whatever involves the worship of King Demos as of a divine monarch who may decree what he likes, may put down one and set up another, dealing with all as his tools to execute his commands, I repudiate . . . Whoever flatters a mob . . . does not reverence a people, does not love them, but hates or despises them. With this flattery I would join the boast of conforming to the will of the majority. So help me God, I do not mean to follow the will of a majority . . . If it could be put to the vote of the greatest number what they would have for happiness, I have no security that they would not decide for something profoundly low and swinish.' (p. 194-5.)

Reactionary? Perhaps so; but is there no element of prophetic foresight in he following?

'Reconstitute society upon the democratic basis — treat the sovereign and the aristocracy as not intended to rule and guide the land, as only holding their commissions from us — and I anticipate nothing but a most accursed sacerdotal rule or a military despotism, with the great body of the population in either case morally, politically, physically serfs, more than they are at present or ever have been.

> 'If this doctrine of rulers reigning by the Grace of God is cast aside as an obsolete doctrine; if we do not look into the force of it, and claim it for our children and our children's children, then I can see no hope of growth, nothing but endless vicissitude: a continual return to the point from which we started; republics succeeding monarchies; empires swallowing up republics, theories trying to do justice for facts; facts overwhelming theories; men crying for liberty of thought, then crying as loudly for an iron despotism which shall crush all thought.' (p. 195 f.)

Under such conditions the true State and the true Church would not necessarily coincide with the civil and ecclesiastical polity. For —

> 'if in the midst of . . . Anarchy some two or three should proclaim the dignity of Law, and should say, "We at least will obey it", those two or three would constitute a State, and till the Majority joined with them, the Majority would be no State at all.'

Again —

> 'the universal Church, we say, stands, the great representative of mankind — redeemed and restored mankind — and this it would do though it had but a dozen members, and though but one of those members really understood his position.' (p. 205.)

Such a time Maurice thinks may come, for, as Dr. Vidler says, 'he was altogether free from that secular optimism which' — he does well to point out — 'nowadays is too indiscriminately attributed to the Victorians.' (p. 227.) But if it comes, such a time may be one for hope rather than despair. 'A united Worship of the Father, the Son, and the Spirit,' he says, such a Worship as the past contains only a dim shadow of — we have a right to look for. It may come when we least expect it; it will probably come after a period of darkness, fierce contention, utter unbelief.' (p. 207.)

In his final chapter on the light thrown by Maurice upon the true nature of Anglicanism (a word, incidentally, coined, so he tells us, by Maurice himself), Dr. Vidler has many wise things to say. It is refreshing, for example, to hear a modern theologian saying,

> 'No one will be able to understand . . . the English Church and the Anglican Communion, who supposes that the Catholic Church and National Churches are incompatible, or that as a Church becomes more Catholic it becomes less National, or who doubts that the kingdom of Christ consecrates the life of nations . . . National Churches are national not only in the sense of protesting against the super-nationalism of Romanism, but also in the sense of witnessing to the idea of a spiritual polity for each nation.' (p. 214f.)

But the true genius of the Church of England is forgotten when party spirit becomes uppermost and membership of the Church of England 'almost accidental'. Yet this is not surprising if, as Dr. Vidler fears,

> 'probably it is at present the case that only a minority of our clergy has read any theology that was published even before 1900.' (p. 210.)

Undoubtedly such a deplorable state of affairs results in —

> 'A weakening throughout the Anglican Communion of the sense of inheriting and sharing a common and long standing theological tradition or orientation. Without roots of that kind, men become uncertain of their position, and are at a loss to know what to say when they are asked, or when they ask themselves: What is Anglicanism? (p. 210.)

Modern Churchmen may fairly claim that such a false modernity which is ontent to be ignorant of the past is not a sin which can reasonably be laid o their charge. But Dr. Vidler has perhaps a word of warning for them when e says:

> 'The Liberal System aimed at recasting the traditional forms of the Church so as to bring them in unison with the spirit of the present age, and to build a Church upon the comprehension of all current varieties of theological opinion.' (p. 217.)

Maurice himself appears to have seen only the danger and the evils to hich any formation of parties within the Church may be prone, and perhaps)r. Vidler is a little too ready to follow him in this respect. Both overlook ie fact that if duly subordinated they can do much to foster the spirit of hristian comprehensiveness and doctrinal development, and, in Maurice's ords, to realise —

> 'the express vocation of the English Church — to bring together feelings which were never meant to be separate, though the evil nature of man is always trying to separate them; to do justice to Romanism, and justice to Protestant dissent, not by yielding a jot to either, but by satisfying the real cravings of the earnest spirits who are entangled in both.' 'We shall no further assert the superiority of the Anglican Church, than as we prove it to have a wider platform of truth, and to be less arrogant and intolerant than others.' (p. 224.)

To ensure for the Church of England such a platform of truth is the ideal f English Modernism.

Altogether Dr. Vidler has rendered a most valuable service in giving us is synoptic view of Maurice's theology, and for his sympathetic exposition f it. If at times we do not agree with Maurice, or fail to understand him, yet ie foundations of his thought are luminously clear. As Dr. Vidler presents to us we are enabled to catch glimpses of Maurice's prophetic vision, the ision of that higher synthesis in which our broken lights of truth are made ne.

D. L. Scott.

VEDANTA FOR THE WESTERN WORLD*

'*Vedanta* is not a religion, but religion itself in its most universal and eepest significance,' Professor Radhakrishnan has said, and this book is an ttempt to show that this is the case. It is an interesting book though the eventy essays and translations which comprise it are of somewhat unequal alue and cover a very wide range — Psychology, *Yoga* teaching, Meditations n the Lord's Prayer and the Sermon on the Mount, Studies in Mysticism, nd some account of leading personalities in the history of *Vedanta,* to quote t random from the titles on the contents page.

The Introduction by the Editor is one of the best and clearest simple state- ients that we have seen, of a philosophy unfamiliar for the most part to estern readers. The author's mode of treatment is indicated when he says:

> '. . . I am writing for Western and I hope intelligently sceptical readers. It is my business to describe and not to dogmatize. Here is one explanation of the known facts of our human experience. You can accept it or reject it. But unless you understand its main propositions, the literature of *Vedanta* will scarcely be intelligible to you.'

The concept of the *Brahman-Atman,* the meaning and purpose of *Yoga,*

* *Vedanta for the Western World,* edited by Christopher Isherwood. (George Allen and nwin. 16/-.)

the hypothesis of *Karma* and reincarnation are treated at some length, and there is a brief — perhaps too brief — account of the life and teaching of one of the most remarkable personalities who has ever influenced Hindu thought, Sri Ramakrishna, the greatest exponent of *Vedanta*. Many of the questions which vex mens' minds — the injustice in the world, man's inhumanity to man, the frustrations and anxieties of life — are faced, and the author attempts to show how the 'law' of *Karma* supplies a convincing answer — though it is possibly not one which will be acceptable to most people brought up in a Christian milieu. The Christian reader is unlikely to find himself wholly in sympathy with the pantheism which asserts that 'the one impersonal *Brahman* may have an infinite number of personal aspects,' or with the view that Jesus is but one of many *avators* or incarnations Rama, Krishna, Gautama and Ramakrishna being others. Of the last, the author writes,

> '. . . In the presence of his smiling certainty, the scholar and the reformer became silent: their own doubts and anxieties ceased. One is reminded of another great prophet who lived as a member of a subject race with a vast imperial system, but the parallel is misleading. Nobody ever asked Ramakrishna to head a nationalist movement or to decide whether it is right to pay tribute to Caesar. His life was happier than that of the Galilean.'

The history of the Ramakrishna Mission after the death of its founder is given in outline and there is an unpublished lecture by his most prominent disciple, Swami Vivekananda: one could wish that the book contained more of the teaching of this great Vedantist — the Paul of *Vedanta*.

In his articles on *Yoga,* Swami Prabhavananda elaborates the treatment given in the introductory essay. The core of the *Yoga* doctrine, he tells us, 'is a method of discipline whereby the root impressions (*samskaras*) may first be overcome and then destroyed, whereby a complete transformation of character may in the end be effected.' There is, he maintains, 'a power inherent in the mind, through which, restraining itself, it can overcome the unconscious and all its tendencies, and achieve by so doing, a complete renewal. Thus is its original purity restored — a purity that reflects the supreme purity and infinite knowledge of the divine self.' The teaching of *Yoga* to 'know thyself' is in harmony with modern western psychological teaching, even if the philosophical conclusions are markedly different from those familiar to western thought. 'Be ye transformed by the renewing of your own mind' — that is the essence of *Yoga*. There is much in these essays by the Swami, which is of great practical interest and much which the harrassed western world might apply to its own problems, with profit!

The article by Gerald Heard on '*Vedanta* as the Scientific Approach to Religion' gives much food for thought although it is perhaps somewhat suggestive of propaganda. 'Why has Western religion failed?' asks the author. 'Youth to-day', he tells us, 'when its hunger for meaning grows unbearable, will turn, not to the Churches but to those who preach crusading nationalism.' Western religion — by which he presumably means Christianity — has failed for three reasons: (a) because it tied itself to a crude apocalypticism based on a very limited Hebrew world of long ago; (b) because it neglected Psychology and Psycho-physiology; (c) because it became brutally intolerant. Doubtless these criticisms have some measure of justification, but they appear to ignore the fact that progressive movements do exist within the Christian Church: that the relevance and importance of Psychology to religion is being increasingly recognised: that tolerance is not a virtue foreign to all schools of thought within the Christian fold — though it is well to distinguish

etween tolerance and intellectual and spiritual flabbiness. The writer con-emns, apparently as typical of Christianity, just those weaknesses of tradion-lism which the Modern Churchmen's Union exists to combat. We feel that ıe statement scarcely does justice to virile Christianity when we read,

> 'the blend of Hebrew and Greek thought made the armature on which was built up that occidental way of life which has been called Christendom which is to-day in ruins and even if it stood it would be too small an arch to span that diversity of mankind which to-day physical science brings into contact, though it cannot combine. That can only be done by a Psychology, an applied knowledge of the human *psyche* as comprehensive and as exact as is to-day the West's applied knowledge of physical science. It is this which India possesses, and at last in the *Vedanta* Mission has shown an apostolic desire to give to mankind. Here then, and here alone lies the hope not of personal salvation . . . but of a new and balanced philosophy and *praxis* of life which could provide sane and progressive living for a unified mankind.'

Ve are not convinced that Christianity is by nature so sterile that it too ›uld not effect these benefits and we are reminded of G. K. Chesterton's ›mment long ago that 'Christianity has not been tried and found wanting; has been found difficult and so never really tried.'

We feel that few liberal-minded Christians would not find themselves ı considerable agreement with Mr. Gerald Heard when he writes in his essay ın 'My Discoveries in *Vedanta*', that there are three correlated truths which ave grown into a unity of understanding. The first is that God alone is holly real: the second is that we fail to see Reality though he is always resent, because we are dissipated: once we recollect and present our attered being, bringing the facets into one focus, we cannot but see the resence. The third is that this transmuting event is not something which e have to wait for till we die, something we may hope for after death, but mething which we may have the moment we can ask for it wholly with pirit, mind and body — Then we see that God has always been present, closer nan breathing, nearer than hands and feet.

Mr. Aldous Huxley has contributed a number of stimulating and thought-rovoking essays — more in fact than any other contributor. He has some ıteresting things to say on such questions as spiritual healing, psychic mani-estations and miracles — though perhaps his treatment of the last is not holly satisfying. His seven meditations and his reflections on the Lord's rayer are really excellent of their kind and end with an apt warning to those hose liberalism has passed into a mere humanism.

> 'It may be,' he says, 'that the Lord's Prayer is generally misunderstood or not understood at all. Nevertheless it is a good thing that it should remain the most familiar formulary used by a religion, which, particularly in the more liberal of its contemporary manifestations has wandered so far from the theocentrism of its founder into an entirely heretical anthropocentrism.'

The five Meditations on the Sermon on the Mount, by Swami Prabhavan-nda are among the high lights of the book and contain some admirable ethical aching and much practical common sense combined with a devotional treat-ent which is very satisfying.

Christopher Isherwood's very clear articles on the attitude of the *Gita* wards war, might be read in conjunction with Mr. Dewick's review of rofessor Radhakrishnan's recent commentary, and expresses much the same nclusions. (*M.C.*, December, 1948).

It is impossible within the limited confines of a review to deal with all the

articles in this book of 450 pages, through which there runs no uniform theme save that it deals with the Vedantist's approach to all manner of questions. Hindu religious thought has much to teach, which our fevered western world might learn with profit. There is a tranquility, a spirituality and a desire for knowledge of, and mystical intercourse with God which is fully comparable with the best that Christian saints and mystics have revealed. The road which the Hindu and the Christian travel may at times be far apart; at times they draw close together. But the ultimate goal is the same. Jesus said, 'Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God'. Ramakrishna has said 'Men and women weep rivers of tears . . . because they cannot get riches, but who sheds a single tear drop because he has not been fortunate enough to see the Lord?''

R. Simpson.

STUDIES IN THE PERSONALITY OF JESUS*

Dr. H. J. Cadbury, a leading authority on Gospel Philology, textual criticism, historical background and interpretation, as well known in England as in U.S.A. has produced a series of studies in the Personality of Jesus. These studies are not theological and dogmatic but historical and literary reflections based on an open-minded modern study of the Gospel sources. Dr. Cadbury's *bête noir* is the modernisation of Jesus. Yet it has to be recognised that the supreme genius, especially the moral and spiritual genius, is the eternal contemporary of mankind. To-day Shakespeare is as modern as Mr. Bernard Shaw and Plato as modern as Karl Marx.

Dr. Cadbury insists, and rightly, on the 'Jewishness' of Jesus — His background, education, environment. But how far was His outlook Jewish?

In his lecture, Dr. Cadbury is mainly concerned with what we should call the psychology of Jesus. Whence did Jesus think He derived His Gospel? What kind of authority did He claim for His teaching? What kind of response to it did He expect from His scholars? Why did He speak in Parable? Was His Gospel original? If so, in what sense? Did Jesus regard it as original or as the reiteration by Him of eternal truth, needful for all and always accessible but too often ignored by the careless, callous and those over-anxious about their material concerns?

Dr. Cadbury has many interesting things to say on these points but they are bound, as the result of his methods, to be only half-truths and as a consequence the quality of the personality of Jesus is apt in some measure to be obscured. We get the impression that it was the Messianic claims which the followers of Jesus made for Him and the proofs which they adduced in support of those claims which secured the influence of Jesus on subsequent ages, rather than the amazing quality of the Saviour's personality expressing itself not only in the originality and insight of His Gospel but also in the amazing courage, authority and attractiveness of His method of teaching. Dr. Cadbury shrinks and rightly from that 'lavish praise' and uncritical enthusiasm which in an age of scientific and historical criticism, creates reactions which do more to discredit the hero than exalt Him. There is something in Dr. Cadbury's temper which recalls the 'suppressed enthusiasm' of Bishop Butler.

Every critical student of Gospel origins should read this book, not for its conclusions, for in some respects Dr. Cadbury is disappointingly inconclusive, but for its *obiter dicta*. For example: What did Jesus condemn when he rebuked hypocrites and hypocrisy? We should have replied: 'Exhibitionism' in Religion, play-acting, the use of Religion to secure personal advantages

* *Jesus, What Manner of Man*, by Henry J. Cadbury. (Shaffer Lectures for 1946. Macmillan. 1948. $2.25.)

nd emoluments. In short religious externalism exhibited to procure irreligious advantages. But Dr. Cadbury defines hypocrisy as 'inconsistency rather han insincerity'—something that was irrational rather than immoral, a elf-defeating incongruity in conduct. Dr. Cadbury writes:

'The word (*hypokrites*) deserves some consideration especially in the light of its history and its gospel context. The English transliteration is probably not a very accurate translation of *hypokrites*. Nowhere does any secular writer seem to apply the Greek word to feigned righteousness, nor does that meaning fit the gospel passages generally. These seem to point, as I have suggested, to the incongruity of behaviour, straining out the gnat and swallowing the camel, concerned for the mote and ignoring the beam, rather than at conscious insincerity. It is difficult to know now what Aramaic word if any lies behind the Greek *hypokrites*. The Hebrew word (*haneph*) so translated in the Old Testament means profane. Neither this nor the literal Greek meaning of 'actor', that is, stage player, fits the gospel occurrences any better than does hypocrite in English. To judge from the full context of the passages is more satisfactory than to trust in the obscure epithet, and the context implies inconsistency rather than insincerity.' (p. 83.)

Notwithstanding this, we cannot but think that there is an intensity of etestation in the Gospel condemnations of hypocrisy as an offence, not only gainst reason but also against the moral consciousness and spiritual religion vhich make it in the eyes of Jesus, the cardinal sin. Is not this an example of he moral originality of Jesus?

Dr. Cadbury's volume collects a number of arresting citations from eminent cholars. We conclude with one on the originality of Jesus from that most liscerning and sympathetic Jewish disciple of Jesus, Dr. C. G. Montefiore.

'The Beatitudes as a whole seem more than each one taken separately. There is a certain glow and intensity about them which seems new and distinctive. We can find Rabbinic parallels to each of them, but as a whole they seem original. If I be asked, 'In what does the impression left by the Beatitudes in *Matthew* seem to you peculiar and original?' I find it very hard to put that impression into words. Perhaps it is a feeling as if all religion were concentrated and expressed in a certain condition of soul, which manifests itself in gentleness and pity and love and the patient endurance of wrong; in a certain peacefulness, which is also capable of utmost heroism and sacrifice, in a certain glow and enthusiasm, which produce a peculiar and indomitable happiness. Before the ideal of this religion all else appears to fade away; all that is external and institutional; all that is civic and political; all that has to do with beauty and knowledge; all that makes for the careful and orderly and gradual removal of evils by intelligent forethought or wise legislation; all conceptions of progress. All these things are good and are necessary, and yet the Beatitudes seem to teach the one thing needful which is more needful than any of them, and which goes both before them and after them. The Beatitudes seem to illustrate the unqualified absoluteness of the teaching of Jesus.' . . . (*The Hibbert Journal,* October, 1929, p. 109.)

H.D.A.M.

THE COLOUR BAR*

In spheres where emotion and prejudice rule it is refreshing to have an bjective exposition of facts. Dr. Little supplies the relevant facts in his xhaustive survey of the present state, as well as the past history, of the oloured man in our midst.

* *Negroes in Britain,* by K. L. Little, M.A., Ph.D. (Kegan Paul. 25/-.)

The first part of the book is concerned with a typical coloured community, namely, the coloured folk of Cardiff, largely maritime in occupation and antecedents. Dr. Little describes his field-work methods, his technique of inquiry, how to make contacts, and so on. The investigators 'found a strong vein of friendliness amongst the individuals concerned, whether African, West Indian, White, Arab or "mixed blood."' These people inhabit the dock area of Cardiff, in the district known as Bute Town; and the port being one of the chief centres of the tramp trade gives a seaman a better chance of employment. Speaking of coloured households, one observer, quoted by Dr. Little, says:

> 'The men are generally really attached to their homes and spend much of their spare time there; they are affectionate and kind and make much of their wives. Some of them are exceedingly thoughtful and do very much to help, and they do their best for the children whom they almost spoil. When a man is paid off his ship and comes home, the children certainly benefit from the lump sum he brings.'

But Dr. Little's description of the Bute Street area and the life therein contains some unsavoury features which perhaps are common to seaports the world over. What he says is always factual and full of interest, and of great value to the sociological student.

Highly interesting also is the second half of the book, concerned with the negro in Britain from 1600 to the present day. They seem to have been introduced first as slaves in the time of Elizabeth as an outcome of the expeditions of John Hawkins between Africa and the New World. English participation in the slave trade did not become significant until about the time of the Restoration. But the population of black-a-moors' in London grew quite substantially as it became the fashion among the nobility and leisured class to possess them as servants. 'For a cookmaid we have, ever since Bridget went,' writes Pepys, 'a black-a-moor of Mr. Batelier's, Doll, who dresses our meat mighty well, and we mightily pleased with her.' The great ladies of the eighteenth century were not averse to having a black boy to wait on them, aware of the advantage of having their own complexions set off by the dusky hue of their attendants. Negro servants and slaves were given classical names, Pompey, Plato, Socrates, and so on. The law concerning their status not being precisely defined, West Indian negroes did their best to get over to England to secure their freedom, though the bid for liberty was not always successful.

There is a chapter on the coloured man's reactions to the English to-day. Perhaps the most fundamental consideration in racial contacts here is that they are usually extremely limited so far as coloured students and the more residential coloured population are concerned; restricted largely to persons acting in some official or semi-official capacity — university teachers, government officials, landladies and so on. The coloured man does not get very far in social relationship with ordinary people; his contacts are impersonal. There are various types of discrimination with their resultant repercussions. Inconsistency between professions and behaviour on the part of the English is complained of; and the absence of legal discrimination is no guarantee of equality of opportunity.

The crucial issue, of course, is that of miscegenation, a word which, however, does not occur in this volume's index, though mixed marriages are mentioned and discussed. A strange and perhaps pathological phenomenon, mentioned by Dr. Little, is that the negro is sexually attractive to some white women. This indeed became conspicuous when black U.S. troops were over here during the war. Dr. Little points out that social prejudice, where it exists, against coloured people is linked up with the fear of intermarriage, more particularly of an English woman with a coloured man. In Cardiff a

white girl marrying a coloured man runs a very considerable danger of social ostracism, not only from acquaintances and friends, but from her own relatives. An instinctive feeling against miscegenation really makes normal social relationships impossible, even with the best will in the world. Dr. Little gives the case of an educated coloured man who corresponded with a female 'pen-friend' in England, but found on coming here that the friendship must lapse. He was naturally hurt, but one does not see how it could be otherwise. Endogamy and inbreeding may be bad, but to cross completely diverse strains is biologically speaking no better. And if miscegenation is bad, equally so is the corruption of one culture by another. That our modern dancing, music and sculpture is negroid is a manifest sign of our Western spiritual and artistic indigence, not to say degeneracy.

Difficulties of contact between different races of men are bound to be great; but differences need not necessarily be thought of in terms of superiority and inferiority. But in any case what is required is more ample mutual knowledge, and this is just what a work of this kind will supply. This book is solid in its information, restrained and judicious in its judgments. Both coloured people and ourselves stand in debt to Dr. Little.

J.C.H.

THE LITURGICAL GOSPEL*

If we wished to summarise each of our Canonical Gospels by a single adjective we should call St. Mark's, the Archaic Gospel; St. Luke's, the Evangelistic Gospel; St. John's, the Theological Gospel; St. Matthew's, the Liturgical Gospel. It is the liturgical character of St. Matthew's Gospel which is admirably elucidated in Dr. Kilpatrick's *The Origin of the Gospel according to St. Matthew*.

Of course St. Matthew's Gospel has many other characteristics. It is the most Jewish of our Gospels as we shall have reason to note in this review. It is the most apocalyptic of our Gospels in its eschatology. These features of it have been often emphasised by its exponents, but we venture to think that its pre-eminently liturgical character has hitherto escaped recognition.

This Gospel was written, not primarily for Christian catechists and converts, but for public reading to Christian congregations at Divine Service. It was intended to be the possession of a great Christian Church, the Church of Antioch.

Dr. Kilpatrick does not favour Antioch as the place of the Gospel's origin, but suggests that it was composed for a church on the Phoenician coast, possibly Tyre or Sidon. Yet this Gospel is pre-eminently interested in St. Peter and his apostolic pre-eminence, particularly in his headship of the Apostolic band. But neither in the New Testament nor in early Christian literature have we any record of St. Peter's relationship to the Church of Tyre or to any other of the Phoenician coast towns.

The Patriarchs of Antioch have claimed him without contradiction as the Apostolic Founder of their Church and St. Peter's relationship to the Church of Antioch in this capacity is far more securely established historically than his relationship to the Church of Rome. It was at Antioch that St. Paul withstood St. Peter to the face (Gal. ii 11) because St. Peter, under pressure by St. James' emissaries from Jerusalem had abandoned the liberal practice which sanctioned the eating together of Jewish and Gentile Christians in Antioch. Plainly, at this time St. Peter was the most important person in the Church of Antioch.

* *The Origins of the Gospel according to St. Matthew*, by G. D. Kilpatrick. (Clarendon Press, Oxford. 1946. 12/6.)

In the *Acts of the Apostles* it is Antioch which after Jerusalem is the great Church of first century Christianity. But before 70 A.D. the glory had departed from the Church of Jerusalem and the Gospel of St. Matthew was written before the Church of Rome claimed St. Peter as her apostolic Founder.

It is not without significance for its Antiochene origin that *Matthew* is first cited in Christian literature by Ignatius the second Bishop of Antioch and that Theophilus (6th successor of St. Peter in the Bishopric of Antioch as Jerome reckons him) is the first Christian writer to expound the dogma of the Trinity. (*Ad autolycum.*)

There can be little doubt that Theophilus was inspired to undertake his exposition of the Trinity by the liturgical practice of his Church authorised by the Triune Baptismal Formula of *Matthew* xxviii: 19.

The Church of Tyre compared with the Church of Antioch was in the first century obscure in the extreme.

When St. Paul, on his third missionary journey was compelled to stay with his travelling companions at Tyre, on their way up to Jerusalem, there does not appear that there was any organized church at Tyre with its 'Presbyter Bishops' to be saluted.

In *Acts* xxi: 4, reference is made only to 'the disciples' and it took some hunting on St. Paul's part to discover their whereabouts. St. Luke writes as translated in the R.V. 'having found the disciples'—but this is an inadequate rendering. The Greek verb (*aneurisko*) used here means to find after search a little group existing in back streets and so few in number that the *all* with their wives and children came down to the beach to bid St. Paul's company 'Good-bye'.

There was in the first century no church in Syria whose claim to St. Matthew's Gospel can compare with that of Antioch.

We touch on one further point bearing on the connection of St. Matthew's Gospel with Antioch. Dr. Kilpatrick writes:—

> 'according to *Gal.* ii:8, Peter was called to the ministry of the circumcision. This would bring him and our Gospel together and separate both from Antioch.' (p. 134.)

We venture to think that Dr. Kilpatrick does not realize what a large and influential body of Jews dwelt in Antioch in the first century of our era.

In this connection Streeter's statement that Antioch was the only place which the double drachma had the precise value assigned to it in *Matthew's* story of St. Peter catching the fish with a coin in its mouth is worth noting.

If we may safely speak of St. Mark's Gospel as the Roman Gospel, St. John's as the Ephesian Gospel, we can as securely claim St. Matthew's to be the Antiochene Gospel.

Burkitt described *Matthew's* Gospel as the second edition of *Mark's* Gospel enlarged and corrected, but Dr. Kilpatrick has advanced beyond Burkitt in emphasising its liturgical character.

Dr. Kilpatrick's summary of the evidence for the liturgical aim and style of St. Matthew's Gospel is as follows:—

> 'The stylistic changes from Mark increase lucidity. Unnecessary and distracting details are omitted. The additions make the passages easier to follow. Antithesis and parallelism are introduced, repetition of formulae is common, and the phrasing is carefully balanced and rounded.' (p. 72.)

He supports his argument with abundant proofs and in a most convincing manner. The liturgical form of the Lord's Prayer in *Matthew* is immediately recognisable when compared with the Lord's Prayer as it is in *Luke*. The printing of so much of *Matthew* as verse in Moffat's version supports the argument for *Matthew's* liturgical character.

Another very valuable contribution made by Dr. Kilpatrick deals with the character of the Judaism reflected in *Matthew* which definitely differs from the Judaism reflected in *Mark*. *Mark's* Judaism is earlier than 70 A.D. whereas *Matthew's* Judaism is later than 70 A.D. and reflects the influence of the rabbinical 'tightening up' movement inaugurated at Jamnia which rendered it impossible for Christian Jews to continue to take any part in the religious life of the Jewish synagogues. Up till the martyrdom of St. James, the Lord's brother, about 66 A.D., Jewish Christians seem to have continued to use the Temple in Jerusalem as a place of worship. This change in the relations of Christians and Jews before and after 70 A.D. is most interestingly presented in Chapter vi 'The Gospel and Judaism.'

H.D.A.M.

THE DESTRUCTION OF THE TEMPLE BY TITUS*

This study is a welcome addition to the remarkably meagre literature concerning the effects of the Jewish national overthrow in A.D. 70. Its author is conscious of the fact of the curious neglect of the subject, particularly by Christian writers; but it would appear that he himself is far from realising the proportions of the problem as it concerns the study of Christian Origins.

The theme of the monograph, as its title indicates, is specifically the Jewish reaction to the catastrophe of A.D. 70. But, since that reaction finds no formal or definitive expression in rabbinical literature, it has to be assessed mainly by analysing the Jewish apologetic designed to meet the Christian polemic based on the signal destruction of the Temple; the composition of this polemic, Schoeps believes, was consequent on the Bar-cochba revolt and first found expression in the *Epistle of Barnabas*.

After noting the thesis of H. Windisch (*Der Untergang Jerusalem im Urteil der Christen und Juden,* Theolog. Tijdschrift, Leiden, 1914) that the Christian attack of the Synagogue took the form of proclaiming that the overthrow of the Jewish metropolis and the destruction of its Temple confirmed the prophecy of Jesus and constituted a divine judgment on His Crucifixion, Schoeps comments that Windisch never proved this thesis and he proceeds himself to set forth what he considers to have been the true pattern of the Christian polemic. Its source, as he believes, is to be found in the concept of the Temple ἀ χειροποίητον of *Mk.* xiv. 58, and it *'oeffnet allen spaeteren Deutungen schon Tuer und Riegel'*. Its pattern is completed by *John* ii. 21, iv. 21 sq. and in *Hebrews* viii. 2, and provides a Christian spiritualized counterpart to the Jewish complex of a holy city, with its shrine, high-priest, and sin-offering. This divine substitute for the institutions of the Old Covenant was, moreover, held to be attested by the events of A.D. 70, which also signified God's judgment upon the Jews for the Crucifixion of Jesus.

Having thus elucidated what he believes to be the classic form of Christian anti-Jewish polemic, Schoeps then proceeds to show from various rabbinical documents how this attack was met. The chief line of defence was that of representing the catastrophe of A.D. 70 as the result of Israel's failure to observe the Law; indeed so far was this line worked that the actual building of the Temple was attributed to the fall of a firebrand from heaven, so that the heathen Titus could not boast that he had destroyed the House of God (*Echa* v. I, 13). Other and later forms of the reaction are described, notably that which interpreted the *Geserah* (Verhaengnis) as marking the beginning of a new epoch in the life of Israel '*indem es als ein Volk ohne Land und*

* *Die Tempelzerstoerung des Jahres 70, in der Juedischen Religionsgeschichte,* by H. J. Schoeps. (Pp. 45. (Coniectanea Neotestamentica, vi.) Seminarium Neotestamenticum Upsaliense: Uppsala, 1942.)

Staat Ersatz fuer beides in Lehrhaus *fand, das fortan zum "Hueter der Verfassung" wurde—jener Verfassung eines Gottesstaates, der zur Sichtbarwerdung auf Erden nur 4 Ellen Halacha bedarf und deren Kommentar in 12 Folianten, Mischna und Gemara, als Extrakt jahrhunderte-langer Gespraechstradition vorliegt.'*

The chief weakness of this study lies not in its exposition of the Jewish reaction to A.D. 70, but in its prefatory account of the Christian reaction to Israel's overthrow. The author clearly has not explored the significance of the curious lack of explicit reference to the Jewish catastrophe in the New Testament writings, neither does he give any evidence that he is aware of the problem which the Matthean Gospel constitutes in this connection, nor does he seem to have considered the meaning of the rehabilitation of Paul's reputation which is indicated in the Markan Gospel, the *Acts of the Apostles,* and the composition of the *Corpus Paulinum.*

The study concludes with an interesting account of the Jewish attitude towards the rebuilding of the Temple. In particular it may be noted that Dr. Schoeps rejects the view of J. Vogt (*Kaiser Julian und das Judentum,* Leipzig, 1939) that the silence in the Talmud about Julian's attempt to restore the Temple was due to its lack of success, and he maintains instead that the cause of that silence is to be found in the view that Israel's redemption could not be effected by human agency but by the Will of God alone. Moreover, he suggests that Jewish apathy to Julian's undertaking resulted from the current belief that the Temple must be restored by the Messiah of Davidic descent.

In his notes Dr. Schoeps gives evidence of acquaintanceship with a wide range or relevant literature; accordingly it is strange that he makes no reference to R. T. Herford's monograph entitled: *The Effect of the Fall of Jerusalem upon the Character of the Pharisees.* (The Society of Hebraic Studies, No. 2, London, 1917), or the Study of B. Pin: *Jérusalem contre Rome, Un duel pour l'hégémonie en Mediterranée orientale* (Paris, 1938).

S. G. F. Brandon.

RABBI PAUL: THE CHRISTIAN THEOLOGIAN

The debt which the Christian Religion owes to St. Paul as Christian missionary and ecclesiastical statesman is tremendous. How much it owes to St. Paul as a Christian theologian is a matter of dispute.

Paul regarded himself as the slave of the Lord Jesus Christ, Israel's long-expected Messiah. In its most essential content the Gospel of Paul is the Gospel of Jesus. Nevertheless, there are characteristic elements of the Pauline Gospel which are best described as Paulinism. These are not derived from the Gospel of Jesus. Whence did Paul derive them? The answers given by modern scholars differ. Montefiore is convinced that they were not derived from Palestinian Rabbinism. He does not believe in St. Paul's claim that he was a Hebrew of the Hebrews, brought up at the feet of the Rabbi Gamaliel in Jerusalem. He is convinced that Paul was a Jew of the *Diaspora* and his Judaism is a fusion of Hellenism and non-rabbinical Judaism. On the other hand, Mr. W. D. Davies, Professor of New Testament Studies in the United College of Bradford, in his recently published volume *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism,** takes the opposite view. He maintains that where St. Paul's own amazing Christian experience is not the source of his Paulinism, it can all have been derived from Palestinian Rabbinism. Mr. Davies supports his arguments with a wealth of evidence.

Of recent years scholars have come to recognize that the fusion of rabbinical Judaism with popular Hellenist philosophy was much more advanced than

* *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism,* by W. D. Davies, B.D. (S.P.C.K., 1948; 27/6.)

ıd formerly been supposed. Of course in the period of the Maccabaean volt and in the subsequent reigns of the great Maccabaean patriots 68-63 B.C.) there was an intense Palestinian reaction against Hellenism, as so in the period following on the destruction of the Temple (70 A.D.), but in e intervening century Hellenism was exercising a penetrating influence on ıdaism, particularly in the doctrine of the future life where Platonic in-ıence was strong, and in the sphere of ethics where Stoicism was not less fluential. St. Paul records that it was 'at the feet of Gamaliel' that he ceived his rabbinical education. The great school of the 'House of amaliel' (*Gamaliel* i and ii) in Jerusalem was notable for its inclusive con-ct with Hellenism — five hundred of its pupils studied Greek philosophy in ldition to their studies in the *Torah*. No doubt this Greek education was tended for purposes of Jewish propaganda in the Gentile world. When St. aul wrote

> 'To the Jews I became a Jew that I might win the Jews and to the Greeks I became a Greek that I might win the Greeks,'

was voicing his loyalty to the ideal and method of his old school. Never-eless, in the light of his conversion to Christ neither Jewish legalism nor reek philosophy and mystery cults were primary. They might be used only means to an end — and that end the conversion of both Jew and Greek to ith in Jesus Christ as the supreme revelation of the love of God and the sdom of God.

St. Paul's conversion was due to the martyrdom of Stephen and the sion on the Damascus road. This experience compelled Paul to study the rsonal history and Gospel of Jesus. St. Paul possessed a profound know-lge of both. This was emphasized years ago by Canon Knowling, who serves more credit than he has received for his two books in support of at thesis. According to Professor Davies, St. Paul discovered in the teach-g of Jesus a new *Torah* which illuminated, fulfilled and surpassed the Mosaic *rah*. When, however, Professor Davies seeks to prove, with much erudi-n and ingenuity, that the two great Christian sacraments of initiation and lowship are in St. Paul's teaching essentially Jewish in their *venue* and gnificance and owe nothing to the Greek mystery cults, we find him less nvincing.

In full agreement with Schweitzer's conception of the Pauline Gospel as minantly eschatological from first to last, Professor Davies sums up thus:

> 'The encounter with the living Christ, the awareness of living in a new creation, the influx of the Gentiles into the true Israel, the experience of a new moral exodus, the discovery of a *New Torah* and the advent of the Spirit, all these were for Paul eschatological phenomena.' (p. 285.)

ld things are passed away; behold they are become new.'

Professor Davies makes some interesting comments on the doctrine of *Shekinah* — the 'dwelling' of the transcendent God with Israel. Some uld identify the *Shekinah* with the Holy Spirit in the Old Testament, but re is an 'invasive energy' in the advent of the Spirit which inspires pro-ecy and heroic action which is not associated with the *Shekinah*. Rather, *Shekinah* is the presence of the 'numinous' which inspires awe, faith, rship. We recall Paul Levertoff affirming that an understanding of the trine of the *Shekinah* would illuminate the significance of 'the glory' *xa*) in the Fourth Gospel and 'the fulness' (*pleroma*) in the Pauline istles.

In the Synoptic Gospels *Shekinah* is rendered 'cloud' (*nephele*) or

'clouds,' *e.g.* in the accounts of the Baptism and Transfiguration and in the prediction of the *Parousia.* In the Pauline theology the *Shekinah* (*pleroma*) dwells in the Christ, in the Church, and in the individual Christian. In these cases it may be regarded as a metonym of the Holy Spirit.

Professor Davies concludes his volume with an acute critical confutation (from the Pauline point of view) of Barth's 'fundamental premiss that no knowledge of God exists in the world save in the hearts of regenerate Christian believers.'

Paul and Rabbinic Judaism deserves a very high place among the many able volumes seeking to interpret the Apostle of the Gentiles and his Gospel of Salvation. Dr. Rashdall was amazed to discover, when studying the Greek and Latin fathers, how slight had been the influence of the peculiar features of the Pauline theology upon the doctrine of the Church before the advent of St. Augustine. Readers of St. J. Thackery's *St. Paul and Contemporary Jewish Thought* (1900), which is still our best English introduction to St. Paul's Rabbinism, will not be able to rest satisfied until they have also read Professor Davies' admirable supplement to it.

We could wish that the author had included in his extensive bibliography Matthew Arnold's *St. Paul and Protestantism*: a remarkable achievement by an English layman. H.D.A.M.

OLIVER QUICK'S LAST BOOK*

The Gospel of the New World, the last course of lectures delivered by Canon Oliver Quick when Regius Professor of Divinity in the University of Oxford and prefaced by a Memoir contributed by Archbishop Temple, constitutes an appropriate close to the scholastic career of a typically English Divine.

Canon Quick was not a great scholar but he had a fine, clear, mind and his contributions aimed at clarification rather than at originality. He was essentially a scholastic, and accurate definitions and fine distinctions characterise his treatment of his themes. His two most important books are *The Christian Sacraments* (1927) and *Doctrine of the Creed* (1938). A volume of less importance but not without interest for our readers is *Liberalism, Modernism and Tradition.* (1922.)

He was strongly orthodox but never obscurantist. He was a conscientious and influential member of the Archbishops' Commission on Doctrine. Archbishop Temple's Memoir presents him in a most attractive light, high spirited, sociable, clear-headed, critical.

Like Hastings Rashdall, Oliver Quick began his scholastic career as 'Head of the School at Harrow'. He was like Rashdall in another aspect. He was a rationalist, not a mystic. Dr. Temple deals with this point as follows:

> 'His theology and his religion were admirably integrated. He did not start with a "religious experience" of which he sought in his theology to give a rational account; nor did he start from an accepted system of thought which he endeavoured progressively to appropriate in "experience". He sometimes said that he never had a "religious experience", and in the misleading sense of that phrase popularised by William James this is probably true. But of course his whole experience was religious, because it was his apprehension of the world as God had made it and therein also of the God who made it.' (p. xiii.)

* *The Gospel of the New World,* by Oliver Quick, D.D. (Nisbet. 1944. 6/6.)

The Gospel of the New World is a collection of eight lectures on The tonement. Their themes are:

1. The Origin of Evil
2. The Christian Doctrine of Man
3. The Old Testament Preparation for the Atonement
4. The Fulfilment in the New Testament
5. From the Fathers to the Middle Ages
6. From the Reformers to the Liberal Protestants
7. The Christian Meaning of 'Sacrifice'
8. Christian Eschatology

Concise, lucid, critical and contemporary we commend these lectures articularly to theological students beginning the study of formal theology. n our last conversation with the author he said: 'I find myself coming round ore to your point of view,' by which he undoubtedly meant that he was nding himself closer to the liberal theology of Rashdall than had been the ase in 1922.

It may however surprise readers of this volume to discover that Canon uick makes no reference at all to Rashdall's Bampton Lectures, *The Idea f the Atonement,* although Canon Quick gives careful consideration to the belardian doctrine of the Atonement and is in sympathy with it as far as it oes but in his view it does not go far enough. H.D.A.M.

THE BROADEST OF BROAD CHURCHMEN*

Peter Abelard (1079-1142) was born in the dawn of a new age, the enaissance of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, which ranks in import- nce with the great ages of the Protestant Reformation and the French evolution. That age saw the creation of the great mediaeval universities, he rise of the Scholastic Movement and the Hildebrandine Reformation, hich sought to purge the Latin Church by liberating it from the authority f the State.

Peter Abelard, a Breton noble, who became a leading figure in the intel- ctual life of the infant University of Paris, played an amazingly important art in the birth of this new age. His treatise *Sic et Non* revolutionized the udy of theology, the supreme interest of the intellectual world of that eriod. *Sic et Non,* more than any other single book, may be said to have itiated the Scholastic Movement, and so Abelard was not only the precursor ut the initiator of that movement. He had an amazingly original mind, emarkable dialectical acuteness and a consistent and persistent courage equal his originality and his acumen. He was the most original and daring hilosophical theologian of the Western Christian world of the Middle Ages, nd deserves to rank in that world as an intellectual force with Thomas quinas, the greatest of his theological successors, and with Augustine of ippo, the greatest of his predecessors. But while Augustine and Aquinas ave secured an influence so great that Latin theology would be insignificant they were excluded, it is othewise with Abelard. Theologically he was born ut of due time, and the Church authorities of his day viewed him with appre- ension and opposition.

The tragedy of his life recorded in his *Historia Calamitatum* is far better nown, unfortunately, than his imperishable contribution to Christian theology. ere again tragedy and scandal beset his path. He was twice charged with

* *Abelard's Christian Theology,* by J. R. McCallum, (Blackwell, 1948. 7/6.)

heresy, at Soissons in 1121 and at Sens in 1140. At Soissons his treatise on the Unity in Trinity was condemned as Sabellian and publicly burnt. At Sens, charged with heresy by St. Bernard of Clairvaux, the most influential personality at that time in Latin Christendom, Abelard, whom his followers asserted was not given a fair opportunity of defending himself, was again condemned for heresy. He died a couple of years later.

The Rev. J. R. McCallum, sometime Exhibitioner of Balliol College, who has already published an English translation of Abelard's *Ethics,* has now placed students of Abelard in his debt by producing a valuable volume entitled *Abelard's Christian Theology,* which is not only a translation (compressed in parts) of Abelard's *Christian Theology,* but in its valuable introductions and appendices adds not a little to our understanding of his personality and teaching.

The most amazing thing about Abelard as a theologian is the way in which he liberated himself from traditionalism. A self-conceited ignoramus might find little difficulty in breaking away from the traditions of a past of which he knew little and for which he cared less, but Abelard had been born and bred in a traditionalism in which he had received the most rigorous education. He was one of the most learned men of his age. The display of patristic learning in *Sic et Non* is astonishing in its variety and appositeness and suggests years spent in the laborious study of the Fathers. It has been suggested, however, that probably many of the citations used have been derived from patristic anthologies or *florilegia,* such as we have in the *catena aurea* of Aquinas. By making a skilful use of such collections, even modern clergymen may secure a reputation for patristic learning to which they are not entitled. But the learning of Abelard is not only patristic. It includes the Greek and Latin classics and also a remarkable knowledge of the Scriptures. Such erudition can not only fetter all original thinking, but even check all freshness of exposition. We recall an Irish student commenting on the lectures of a learned professor: 'It is just wonderful to think of all that old man has got in his head and the very little power he has of getting it out.' In the case of Abelard his originality and the freshness and vigour of his expression outstrip his learning.

Abelard is first and foremost a philosophical theologian. His supreme authority is Reason, and it is in the light of reason that he evaluates the doctrines of Christian theology and the authority of the precepts of Christian morality. For him the Scriptures reveal spiritual and moral truth, but it is Reason (our rational and moral consciousness) which enables human beings to recognise both the truth and the authority of these divine revelations. These divine revelations, so Abelard recognized, were not restricted to Scripture but are granted in Nature and in and through the human reason. Hence all Church doctrine stands at the bar of reason. Abelard's position is that of Bishop Butler: 'Reason is the candle of the Lord within us and that by which we must judge even of Revelation itself.'

Hence, Abelard taught that there is a doctrine of the Divine Unity in Trinity to be found outside the Scriptures, and before they came into existence, in which both Jews and Gentiles have believed. It is unveiled in the Divine Power, Wisdom and Love, and where sought with right intention and faithfully adhered to in practice is the power of salvation for Jews and Gentiles although they be not members of the Catholic Church.

Again, Abelard was as rational and ethical in his exposition of the doctrine of the Atonement as of the Trinity. His interpretation is known as the 'exemplarist' theory of the Atonement and is fully expounded for modern readers in Dean Rashdall's Bampton Lectures. It is important to recall that Abelard's 'Exemplarist Theory' was published before Anselm's 'Satisfaction

heory' as expounded in his *Cur Deus Homo.* Abelard's doctrine of the onement was an enormous advance on the earlier patristic theories of the onement and is closer to our Lord's great parable of the Atonement, the odigal Son, than is Anselm's exposition. Yet for every thousand clergymen o have read *Cur Deus Homo,* scarcely one has read Abelard's *Expositio istolae ad Romanos* which expounds his Atonement doctrine.

Such doctrinal latitude appalled many of Abelard's traditionalist contemraries, and it is not surprising that this broadest of Broad Churchmen used a storm of ecclesiastical criticism. Nevertheless, he retained the loyalty his pupils, and we have a touching memorial of it in their building for him his dark days the Oratory of the Paraclete at Nogent near Paris.

Another activity of Abelard as a Christian theologian is worth noting. ke St. Thomas Aquinas, he composed a number of doctrinal hymns, an ective method of popularizing theological dogma. One of these hymns, *quanta qualia,* translated by J. M. Neale, is published in *Songs of Praise* o. 200).

Not one of the least interesting of Mr. Ramsey McCallum's appendices als with the religious psychology of Abelard. Mr. McCallum writes:

'The distinction between the man of religion and the man who is concerned to bring religion into relation with philosophy and so evolve a Christian philosophy assists us to understand Abelard's work. Light is also thrown on the matter by the consideration that his mind was of the Aristotelian, rational, speculative order. It has been held, perhaps with some reason, that human nature may be divided into two classes of mind: the Platonic and the Aristotelian. In the former class may be set those who are largely concerned with preconceptions from which they start their thinking and in the light of which they interpret experiences. The term "idealist" is often used to denote this style of thought: whereas the realist, in a modern sense of this term, argues from observed fact, checking his hypotheses constantly with reality as he finds it.' (p. 110.)

'Abelard has therefore to be studied in two aspects: his portrait has to be painted in two postures. In the one he is the constructive thinker, taking the data of experience, past and present, as his subject matter and forging a form of thought and belief that co-ordinates it. In this respect he does not limit himself to Christian history strictly so defined. He goes beyond the bounds of the Church of his day: he observes the further fields that lie about it and at some distance from it. In the second aspect Abelard is the theological controversialist. He is not so much the opponent of orthodoxy as the would-be clarifier of the content of orthodox belief.' (p. 112.)

The publication of this illuminating volume on Abelard would have dehted Dean Rashdall, who regarded Abelard as one of the greatest of ristian theologians outside the New Testament. Mr. McCallum expresses indebtedness for assistance to the Rev. C. G. Challenger, Hulsean Prizen and author of *The Excellence of Revealed Religion,* and to Mr. T. Hope yd, who were his fellow-students at Ripon Hall. H.D.A.M.

CORRESPONDENCE

LAMBETH AND REUNION

SIR,

Will you permit a quite obscure person to make an observation on the subject of inter-Communion with which you deal in your admirable article in the magazine for December last?

The differences between Christian bodies being, as they are, mainly about orders and sacraments, your plea for inter-Communion is obviously of the utmost importance for reunion; for the practice of it cannot mean less than admission of the validity of the ministries and sacraments of the different parties joining therein. But I beg to point out that *effective* inter-Communion means more than the invitation by each Church to 'communicant members of all other Christian Churches to join with it in the Lord's Supper'. What is absolutely necessary for the purpose is for members of each Church to *go* to the services of the others, and show, by their presence and their act of communion, there that — however much they may prefer their own services — they make no assumption of superiority, but put the Church they are visiting on a level with their own. For Anglicans to invite and receive Nonconformists to their Communions, and then neglect or refuse to return the visit, would be to confess their action to have been a matter of that detestable thing *patronage*, which the others could not fail to regard as an insult. Let those who wish for reunion, whether formal, or simply of a practical kind, make a point of showing where they stand by voluntarily attending the Lord's Supper in other Churches. There is no question about the welcome Anglicans and others would receive at services in the Free Churches, by attending, they would settle the whole question for themselves. But, of course, it would need a miracle to persuade Anglo-Catholics to do this, and if they were persuaded they would no longer be Anglo-Catholics!

M. J. BENNETT.

CHURCH REFORMATION IN BIRMINGHAM

SIR,

In a time when great changes are impending in the social order, and Churches are continually undergoing reformation within, I think it may interest your readers to know something of these changes that are now happening in large industrial areas and suburbs of Birmingham. A situation such as we are facing would hardly apply to villages and country towns. They have their own problems to solve. What I have to say concerns that part of England which has altered through concentration of industry.

Because of the closely knit framework of industry, where co-operation is essential for smooth running, it is not surprising that relationships between Church bodies in Birmingham are easy and friendly. Historical and doctrinal differences tend to become unreal and even absurd. In the locality where I minister, we have a strong local tradition of Church co-operation that has existed for thirty years, and the feeling is growing, that if we do not co-operate with one another as Churches, we shall have none but ourselves to blame if society degenerates through our schism. In our meetings together every month, we come back to the same point, again and again, that the unity of the Church is not something to talk and argue about, but something to recognise as already there. It still awaits recognition. The Roman Catholic

urch, represented at our Fraternal, acknowledges our baptism. The unity n, is already a fact, and to be otherwise minded is to persist in sin

At Lambeth and at Amsterdam last year, a common concern for unity s expressed. But can such huge bodies do much else? We feel that the uation locally is really more significant. For here we can act. We are acting. nday School teachers and Ministers meet frequently to compare notes as it re, and this meeting together has done more to help us realise the one tholic Church than all high level pronouncements. We hope to co-operate women's work, youth work and missionary work. Then, the large rcentage still unattached to any Church would become aware that the urch is the greatest single factor in the community. At the moment this not so, and Birmingham suggests a floating mass of displaced persons, t to say a kind of concentration camp.

No attempt is made to coax others to adopt our forms of service. But it worth mentioning that Congregationalists, Methodists and Baptists are all roducing Anglican ritual into their services, and Anglicans on their part, ry the form and order of public worship, so that why they should not form t of the English Church is hard to see. Roman Catholics are distinct, but hough they are very strong in this district, they appear still as the odd t. However, history shows that Roman Catholics have a remarkable ability adapting themselves to changing conditions, and political issues are awing us nearer. The Presbyterian Church is again distinct, and has served Church in our district, by revealing through its own Church order, the uring inconsistencies of the Anglican Church in particular, and by the rnness and robustness of its worship, has made us look to our laurels.

If the way to salvation in the political and economic spheres is by devolving sponsibility as widely as possible, such decentralisation is long overdue in Church. Perhaps a local Council of the Church in each important district uld elect its own Chairman as Bishop. Perhaps the Bishop could be the ral Dean and exercise oversight in areas about the size of a deanery. ere are many ways that might be devised to consolidate and encourage local tiative. The Church is very much alive in Birmingham.

H. S. JOSEPH.

ELECTIONS TO THE COUNCIL OF THE M.C.U.

t,

The date of the Annual Business Meeting has not yet been fixed, but it l probably take place in June. In order to comply with our regulations minations for election to serve on the Council for three years must reach a month before the meeting.

Mr. F. J. Aitchison, Rev. A. G. Coombes and Mr. F. Victor Fisher retire s summer and are not re-eligible. The following co-opted members also ire but may be nominated to serve for three years: Rev. A. W. Adams, ss A. M. Ashley, Rev. Canon J. S. Bezzant, Rev. L. B. Cross, Rev. Sir nry Fitzmaurice, Rev. W. G. Fallows, Miss H. Hubbard, Rev. L. C. ckraft, Rev. F. I. L. Rees, Mr. G. A. Riding, the Ven. Archdeacon of ffolk, Miss M. I. Walker, Rev. W. J. S. Weir, Rev. D. E. H. Whiteley, v. T. J. Wood, the Ven. Archdeacon of York. Nominations must be onded by a member. There are ten vacancies to be filled.

R. GLADSTONE GRIFFITH,
Hon. Secretary, M.C.U.

eple Claydon Vicarage,
Bletchley, Bucks.
February, 1949.

A SERIOUS THREAT TO RELIGIOUS FREEDOM

SIR,

I desire to draw the serious attention of your readers to the proposed Bishops' (Retirement) Measure as prejudicial to the well-being of the Church and Nation and to the relations between Church and State. Machinery already exists for settling disputes concerning doctrine, ritual and ceremonial, with ultimate appeal to the Privy Council; and to remove these matters from that level to one of purely ecclesiastical jurisdiction must

(*a*) undermine the rights of the State concerning the Established Church of this country and the tenure of the highest offices in the Church;

(*b*) threaten the freedom of minorities in the Church and thus, also, the comprehensive nature of the Church of England;

(*c*) arrest developments in religious thought and practice. (In the last hundred years the now commonplace views of Low, Broad and High Churchmen have all in turn been condemned by Ecclesiastical Courts, thus proving the need of a higher judicial court of reference);

(*d*) deter able men from seeking ordination, especially in times of intellectual ferment like the present.

If the proposed repressive grounds for the compulsory retirement of bishops be approved, these grounds are likely in due course to be extended and applied also to the lower orders of the Ministry. Never before in this country has essential Christianity been in such danger from identifying it with particularist interpretations and opinions.

Surely all who desire a comprehensive National Church must deprecate that in the proposed Measure

(1) disciplinary action, *i.e.* compulsory retirement, is to be imposed by administrative officers of the Church (*i.e.* bishops) on issues so vague as 'unbecoming conduct' and 'the interests of the Church';

(2) such highly contentious questions as those concerning doctrine, ritual and ceremonial are introduced into a sub-section of the clause which deals with 'Unbecoming Conduct and Neglect of Duty';

(3) the Tribunal (of bishops only) is to receive power (*a*) to hear the evidence in private; (*b*) to curtail, or annul, a retired Bishop's pension if he 'is engaged in any gainful occupation'; (*c*) to make an order against him at their discretion for payment of costs.

Steps ought to be taken without delay to secure the withdrawal of the Measure.

R. D. RICHARDSON.

Ripon Hall, Oxford.